



Bryce Yokomizo
Director

September 23, 2002

TO: Each Supervisor

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Bryce Yokomizo", is written diagonally across the "TO:" line.

FROM: Bryce Yokomizo, Director

SUBJECT: EVALUATION REPORT ON CHILD CARE TRAINING INSTITUTE (CCTI) AND START-UP ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS

Pasillas & Associates, Consultants, in conjunction with research staff of the University of California, Irvine, completed their first evaluation report on the County funded Child Care Training Institute (CCTI) and Start-Up Assistance Programs.

The enclosed evaluation report, released in July 2002, gave both programs high marks on their overall impact during the period of July 2001 through June 2002. In brief, the report states, "the CCTI Program has been successful in working with under served populations, not only to enhance the number of child care providers and services, but even more, it has provided the opportunity for these providers to network and build their professional competencies as part of a community of learners."

Background

Your Board approved the CCTI and Start-Up Assistance Programs on February 16, 1999. CCTI, administered by the Los Angeles County Office of Education, offers a series of workshops on how to operate a private child care business, including training on how to deliver quality child care services. The Start-Up Assistance Program provided educational, as well as health and safety items valued at \$250 to child care providers, who attended a minimum of two CCTI workshops, were licensed and met income level requirements.

Evaluation Report

The purpose of the evaluation report was to ascertain the effectiveness of the CCTI workshops in:

1. Assisting participants in starting up and maintaining a viable child care business;
2. Improving the quality of child care services provided; and
3. Determining whether participants have, as a result of attending CCTI workshops, had success in securing employment in child care services.

Overall Impact and Scope of Programs

- ▶ From May 1999 through December 2001, more than 10,000 individuals attended workshops covering topics such as, legal issues, health and safety, special needs, family care, business and marketing, and CalWORKs;
- ▶ 380 workshops were provided in the following six languages: English, Spanish, Mandarin, Cantonese, Cambodian, and Armenian/Russian; and
- ▶ One third of the recipients came from the Top Fifty Highest Need Zip Codes identified in the Policy Analysis for California Education (PACE) report by UC Berkeley, and one half was representative of the 102 High Need Zip Codes identified in that same report; and

Child Care Providers Evaluation Survey Results

Survey results completed by 8,376 of the more than 10,000 workshop attendees who completed post-training evaluations reflected the following:

- ▶ Workshops have assisted in starting up viable child care businesses, with 41% of the survey group having been licensed and 22% still in the process of obtaining a license;
- ▶ The improvement of quality of child care services provided is reflected by the numerous participants with multiple certificates of workshops attendance; and
- ▶ Success in employment is validated by the fact that 119 of the 159 workshop participants surveyed indicated they were working in the child care field.

The CCTI workshops have made a significant impact in building child care capacity countywide in areas where limited or no child care had been provided. Moreover, CCTI has been instrumental in developing a network of trainers who provide information on "best" child care practices to Los Angeles County's diverse lower income populations.

Current Program Status

The CCTI and Start-up Package Programs were provided with Performance Incentive funds through June 30, 2003 under your Board actions of June 26, 2002, on the CalWORKs and Long Term Self-Sufficiency Funds Prioritization Report.

BY:ko

Enclosure

c: Executive Officer, Board of Supervisors
Chief Administrative Officer
County Counsel
Superintendent, LACOE

*Child Care Training Institute
Workshop
Activities and Understanding Each
Child's Unique Needs
Spring 2002*

**Presenter:
Lupe Avila...
and her crafty corner**



Getting ready to start



**Let's praise
everyone!
They did an
excellent job!!**

I appreciated learning how to make each curriculum a positive learning experience, learning without wasting valuable time.

English Language Workshop participant, *Activities and Understanding*, June 2001

Everything I heard was new and useful.

English Language Workshop participant, *Special Needs*, December 2001

I was a teacher for 14 years in El Salvador. I like that there are opportunities such as this to participate in programs that teach practical, age-appropriate approaches for working on a daily basis with the development needs of boys and girls.

Spanish Language Workshop participant, *Understanding CalWORKS*, February 2001

The most valuable thing I received from this workshop was information about policies and procedures on safety in order to provide a safe environment.

English Language Workshop participant, *Health and Safety*, September 2001

In my training I learned important information about [the legal issues involved in] disciplining children.

Spanish Language Workshop participant, *Legal Issues*, September 2001

The most valuable thing I learned from this workshop was that I have the power to choose and the power to be "unique."

English Language Workshop participant, *Being the Best You Can Be*, May 2001

I attended as many workshops as I knew about and loved them. I liked all of the workshops and have all of my certificates, but I liked Business and Marketing the best. I'd like more workshops and more child care tips and activities information.

Spanish Language participant comments during telephone interview, May 2002

The information about keeping records was particularly helpful.

English Language participant comments during telephone interview, May 2002

When I contacted the [Child Care] training staff for assistance, they were very helpful, very informed about the workshops, and very willing to translate for me.

Mandarin Language participant comments during telephone interview, April 2002

I really enjoyed the classes I attended and I'd like to attend additional workshops, maybe a workshop on loan grants. The Start-Up Package was great!! Thank you.

English Language recipient of CCTI Start-Up Package, March 2001

Everything in my Start-up Package is used daily in my daycare. And truly enjoyed!

Mandarin Language recipient of CCTI Package, February 2001

All the workshops are very important and provide much benefit. The only unfortunate thing is that they fill up quickly and then there is no more room for people who want to attend.

Spanish Language recipient of CCTI Start-Up Package, August 2001

**PROGRAM EVALUATION
FOR
THE CHILD CARE TRAINING INSTITUTE (CCTI)**
Division of Parent and Community Service
Los Angeles County Office of Education

Diane Araujo, MPA, Principal Evaluator
Nancy Christensen, Ed.D. Research Coordinator and Consultant
Maria del Pilar O'Cadiz, Ph.D. Methodology Advisor

July 2002

APPENDIX 9: RATINGS OF TRAINING VALUE BY LANGUAGE GROUP AND YEAR	84
APPENDIX 10: RATING OF ORGANIZATION OF TRAINING BY LANGUAGE GROUP AND YEAR	87
APPENDIX 11: RATING OF PRESENTERS BY LANGUAGE GROUP AND YEAR	90
APPENDIX 12: 2001 RATINGS BY LANGUAGE GROUP	93
APPENDIX 13: DISTRIBUTION OF ATTENDANCE BY MONTHS	98
APPENDIX 14: START-UP PACKAGE EVALUATION FORM	100
APPENDIX 15: START-UP PACKAGE DISTRIBUTION BY ZIP CODE, SUPERVISORAL DISTRICT AND LANGUAGE GROUP	107
APPENDIX 16: RANKINGS GIVEN BY RECIPIENTS TO MATERIALS IN START-UP PACKAGE	111
APPENDIX 17: PROTOCOL FOR TELEPHONE SURVEY	114
APPENDIX 18: DISTRIBUTION OF NUMBER ASSIGNMENT FOR TELEPHONE INTERVIEWEES	127
APPENDIX 19: REPORTS FROM PARTICIPANT OBSERVATIONS AT FIVE WORKSHOPS: OCTOBER 2001–MAY 2002	129

Spanish, Mandarin, Cantonese, Cambodian, and Armenian/Russian. At the end of each workshop, participants were asked to complete a Post-Training Evaluation; 8,376 of these evaluations were available to the research team for analysis. Of this number, 41% reported that they were licensed, 11% reported that they were not licensed, and 22% reported that they were in the process of obtaining a child care license. Workshop attendees who had participated in two workshops, were licensed, and met income level requirements were eligible to apply for a Child Care Training Institute Start-Up Package that contained ~ \$250.00 of child care books, games, and operating materials. Recipients represented all five Supervisorial Districts. One third of the recipients came from the Top Fifty Highest Need Zip Codes identified by CalWORKs. One half was representative of the 102 High Need Zip Codes identified by CalWORKs.

Recipients of the Start-Up Package completed an evaluation form after receiving their package; 182 of these evaluations, covering the time period from May 1999 through December 2001, were available to the research team for analysis. Start-Up package recipients had attended from two to eight workshops. The most frequently attended workshop was *Health and Safety*, followed in order by *Activities*, *Business and Marketing*, and *Legal Issues*. Ninety percent of the recipients were providing child care at the time they received the Start-Up Package. The average number of children receiving child care provided by workshop attendees was 6.78.

Participants reported overwhelmingly positive responses to their Child Care Training experience. High ratings for the value of the instruction, the effectiveness of the presenters, the usefulness of the materials, and relevance of the training to personal needs were consistent across workshop years, across topics, and across language groups. Ninety percent of the recipients agreed or strongly agreed that the Start-Up Package was useful and should be continued. Materials in the Start-Up Package receiving the highest ratings were the First Aid Kit, the art supplies, and the children's books. Ninety-eight percent of the recipients reported that they were very interested in attending additional workshops.

Six hundred and fourteen workshop participants were identified for telephone interviewing; 159 were interviewed from March through May 2002. Over half of the people interviewed had learned about the workshops from either the Department of Public Social Services or their school/school district. Sixteen percent reported that they learned about the workshops from word-of-mouth referrals from friends, relatives, and other providers. Eight percent reported they first learned about the workshops from a Child Care Training Institute flyer.

The researchers observed that the presenters incorporated in their training best practices from current theories in adult learning. They established rapport with the participants and encouraged sharing and networking. The presentations were well organized and supported with numerous materials that participants were able to take with them. Through informal conversations with other attendees, the researchers learned that many of the participants had attended several other workshops and were very appreciative that this resource of current information in the field was available. They were looking forward to attending future workshops and pursuing their professional development as a child care provider.

These findings suggest that the workshops have assisted in starting up viable child care businesses, with 41% of the survey group having been licensed and 22% still in the process of obtaining a license. The improvement of quality of child care services provided is suggested by the numerous participants with multiple certificates of workshops attended and by their affirming comments in the telephone interviews. Success in employment is indicated by the fact that 119 of the 159 workshop participants surveyed by telephone indicated that they were in child care careers. However, the actual impact of workshops on the knowledge base of each participant can be better assessed with a pre-test and post-test study of future workshops. Furthermore, a study of service sustainability and child care delivery quality is recommended in the conclusion. Based on these findings, the Child Care Training Institute Workshops have made a significant impact in building capacity within an area where limited or no child care had been provided. Moreover, CCTI has been instrumental in developing a network of trainers providing current and linguistically sensitive information on best practices in the field to Los Angeles County's diverse lower income populations residing in areas designated in the "high need" category of quality child care service.

TABLE 16	YEAR START-UP PACKAGE RECEIVED: 1999-2001	26
TABLE 17	START-UP PACKAGE RECIPIENTS ATTENDANCE AT WORKSHOPS: 1999-2001	26
TABLE 18	WORKSHOP PARTICIPATION BY START-UP PACKAGE RECIPIENTS: 1999-2001	27
TABLE 19	CARING FOR CHILDREN AT TIME OF SURVEY 1999-2001	27
TABLE 20	NUMBER OF CHILDREN IN CHILD CARE AT TIME OF START-UP PACKAGE SURVEY	28
TABLE 21	START-UP PACKAGE RECIPIENTS' REPORT ON NUMBER OF CHILDREN RECEIVING CARE: 1999-2001	28
TABLE 22	RECIPIENTS' RATING OF USEFULNESS OF START-UP PACKAGE: 1999-2001	29
TABLE 23	RECIPIENTS' RATING ON CONTINUATION OF START-UP PACKAGE: 1999-2001	30
TABLE 24	RECIPIENTS' RATING OF USEFULNESS OF WORKSHOP INFORMATION: 1999-2001	30
TABLE 25	RECIPIENTS' RATING OF HELPFULNESS OF HANDOUTS AND MATERIALS: 1999-2001	30
TABLE 26	RANKINGS GIVEN TO START-UP PACKAGE MATERIALS: 1999-2001	31
TABLE 27	RECIPIENT RECOMMENDATIONS FOR COMPOSITION OF FUTURE START-UP PACKAGES	31
TABLE 28	WILLINGNESS TO ATTEND ADDITIONAL WORKSHOPS	32
TABLE 29	TELEPHONE SURVEY CONTACT: SPRING 2002	33
TABLE 30	TELEPHONE SURVEY: LEARNING ABOUT WORKSHOPS	34
TABLE 31	TELEPHONE SURVEY: ATTENDANCE AT CHILD CARE TRAINING INSTITUTE WORKSHOPS	35

TABLE 49	VALUE OF WORKSHOP: SPANISH LANGUAGE GROUP	85
TABLE 50	VALUE OF WORKSHOP: MANDARIN LANGUAGE GROUP	85
TABLE 51	VALUE OF WORKSHOP: CANTONESE LANGUAGE GROUP	86
TABLE 52	VALUE OF WORKSHOP: CAMBODIAN LANGUAGE GROUP	86
APPENDIX 10		
TABLE 53	ORGANIZATION OF WORKSHOP ENGLISH LANGUAGE GROUP	88
TABLE 54	ORGANIZATION OF WORKSHOP SPANISH LANGUAGE GROUP	88
TABLE 55	ORGANIZATION OF WORKSHOP MANDARIN LANGUAGE GROUP	88
TABLE 56	ORGANIZATION OF WORKSHOP CANTONESE LANGUAGE GROUP	89
TABLE 57	ORGANIZATION OF WORKSHOP CAMBODIAN LANGUAGE GROUP	89
APPENDIX 11		
TABLE 58	EFFECTIVENESS OF PRESENTER ENGLISH LANGUAGE GROUP	91
TABLE 59	EFFECTIVENESS OF PRESENTER SPANISH LANGUAGE GROUP	91
TABLE 60	EFFECTIVENESS OF PRESENTER MANDARIN LANGUAGE GROUP	91
TABLE 61	EFFECTIVENESS OF PRESENTER CANTONESE LANGUAGE GROUP	92
TABLE 62	EFFECTIVENESS OF PRESENTER CAMBODIAN LANGUAGE GROUP	92
APPENDIX 12		
TABLE 63	USEFULNESS OF INFORMATION ENGLISH LANGUAGE GROUP	94
TABLE 64	USEFULNESS OF INFORMATION SPANISH LANGUAGE GROUP	94
TABLE 65	USEFULNESS OF GROUP ACTIVITY ENGLISH LANGUAGE GROUP	95
TABLE 66	USEFULNESS OF GROUP ACTIVITY SPANISH LANGUAGE GROUP	95
TABLE 67	USEFULNESS OF HANDOUTS ENGLISH LANGUAGE GROUP	95
TABLE 68	USEFULNESS OF HANDOUTS SPANISH LANGUAGE GROUP	96
TABLE 69	EFFECTIVE PRESENTER ENGLISH LANGUAGE GROUP	96

INTRODUCTION

The Child Care Training Institute (CCTI) is an educational program offered by the Los Angeles County Office of Education's Division of Parent and Community Services since 1999 to the present. CCTI offers a series of workshops on how to operate a private child care business including training on how to deliver quality child care services. These workshops are open to all individuals residing in Los Angeles County but specifically targeted to populations who are residents in low-income areas where there are limited or no child care services available.

Pasillas & Associates, Consultants, with consulting support from research staff of the University of California, Irvine Department of Education, was contracted in July 2001 to carry out an evaluation of the CCTI program through July 2002 in order to assess its effectiveness in training participants. In particular the CCTI program director needed to ascertain the effectiveness of the CCTI workshops in:

- (a) assisting participants in starting up and maintaining a viable child care business
- (b) improving the quality of child care services provided
- (c) contributing to the success of participants who as a result of attending the CCTI workshops, have had success in securing employment in child care services or elsewhere.

This report provides a brief social-historical context of child care services in the county as well as a general overview of child care problems and needs that the CCTI program seeks to address. It also fully describes the Child Care Training Institute Program, including a historical chronology of the CCTI program delivery. Following these general background sections, the methodology and research questions that guided the CCTI program evaluation are explained briefly. The evaluation findings based on survey, interview, and observational data are summarized. In addition, several appendices are attached to provide further background on both CCTI participants and the research carried out by the evaluation team, including the observational reports written by undergraduate researchers who attended various workshops from October 2001 through May 2002. In conclusion, recommendations for future program development and further evaluative work geared at continuous program improvement are offered.

World War I increased the demand for child care (1917-1918) as large numbers of women went to work in factories that supported the war effort. During this era no federal support was provided and child care demands were met through local governments, expansion of existing private facilities, and informal childcare arrangements (Robins & Weiner, 1978).

After WWI, day nurseries declined in popularity and interest for several reasons: (1) legislation in 1921 restricted immigration; (2) passage of the widow's pension allowed many mothers to stay home with their children; and (3) the 1920's seemed to be a period of affluence and economic expansion which, "did not actually get rid of slums or poverty, but in flush times there seemed to be less reason to notice that not everyone's street was paved in gold. If men were working, they could support their families, and that made the day nursery seem less of a necessity (Steinfels, 1973, p.65)."

1930-1940's

The new public funded initiatives to create job opportunities for the scores of unemployed during the Depression that hit the nation in the early 1930's reenergized efforts to create formal child care arrangements and hence more jobs, in particular for women. According to June Solnit Sale, "The Works Progress Administration [1936-1940] during the Depression established child care programs to set up a cottage industry because it was important to find gainful work for the adults (Tebb, 1997)." Hence, the first major public funding for child care in California became available in 1933 under the federal WPA, initiated by President Franklin D. Roosevelt as part of his New Deal policies aimed at finding jobs for millions on government-sponsored projects (Clarke-Stewart, 1993). In response, school districts were to establish nursery schools that would provide relief work for teachers, cooks, nurses, etc., who otherwise would be unemployed. School districts also established contracts with the junior high schools whose students served as aides in the centers while receiving training in child development (Tebb, 1997). In 1936, the California legislature passed licensing laws to protect children from the common hazards believed to be present in all types of care received in the absence of their parents (On the Capitol Doorstep, 1995; Hubner, 1980; Tebb, 1997). The State Board of Charities was replaced with the newly created State Department of Public Welfare to administer day care licensing (Hubner, 1980; Tebb, 1997).

During the 1930's, and on through the 1960's, Cooperative Child Care [started by University of Chicago faculty wives in 1915], became increasingly popular as child development theories gained influence on educators, policy makers, and the general public throughout the United States (Clarke-Stewart, 1993; Tebb, 1997). According to Tebb (1997), cooperatives demonstrated that when child care is designed to serve children and their families, program quality, particularly the preschool educational experience, is improved. However, despite many advantages of cooperative child care, it was not a viable option for most working mothers as they were largely responsible for

By the mid-1960s, a shared notion existed that problems in American education might best be addressed by interventions that occur early in the child's educational career. A number of studies had shown that economically disadvantaged children in general, and particularly those from traditionally disenfranchised groups or so called "minority" children (i.e. those of non-European background, namely Black, Latino, and American Indian) suffered educational deficiencies when they entered elementary school. These deficiencies persisted throughout the children's schooling as these "minority" children were, on the average, six months behind national norms in the first grade, and two years behind by the fifth grade in school achievement. To give these children a boost in their academic development and to compensate for the lack of schooling preparedness, Head Start was established.

Head Start was one of the first policies carried out by the Johnson Administration as a key component to its War on Poverty initiative under Title II of the Economic Opportunity Act which called for "maximum feasible participation" of low income parents (Smith and Bissell, 1970, p. 56). Head Start had a remarkably rapid turn around period from proposal to programmatic reality: less than one year from the initial Planning Committee formed in November of 1964 to the public announcement of its launching of Project Head Start in early 1965, with programs operating nationwide only six months later by the summer of 1965 (Smith and Bissell, 1970). A study carried out by Smith and Bissell (1970) determined that "Head Start programs have a substantial impact on the scholastic readiness of first-grade children, particularly in predominantly [B]lack urban areas (p. 54)." They also reported that studies of other early child care programs across the country and abroad demonstrated that "*carefully designed and implemented programs* increased the cognitive performance of disadvantaged children (p. 54)."

1970-80's

As a grass roots movement of Northern California in 1970, Resource and Referral (R & R) Services and the Alternative Child Care Program were introduced in the state of California. The Alternative Payment Program (AP) arose from a growing awareness that a standardized delivery system was not meeting the variety of family and community child care needs (Freis & Miller, 1978). To promote program flexibility and to improve program responsiveness to local needs, the California Department of Education (CDE) was allocated \$13 million annually to fund AP arrangements and was expanded to approximately \$17 million in 1977-78 (*On the Capitol Doorstep*, 1995). AP programs were to provide parents needing publicly subsidized child care with greater options, to address unmet community needs, and to develop cost-effective ways to deliver child care and development programs. The program provided for center care, family child care homes, voucher/vendor programs, resource and referral agencies, and capital outlay.

Some of the early research documenting the importance of family child care included the Community Family Day Care Project in Pasadena, California (Solnit, Sale, & Torres, 1971) and the National Council of Jewish Women study in Portland, Oregon (Emlen,

1990-2002

The 1990's experienced a decline in social policies construed as "hand-outs" and a rise in the call for accountability on the part of recipients of such government-funded relief programs. Still, researchers in the educational, social sciences, and public policy areas continued to document the relationship between poverty, low educational attainment, crime, and a perpetuation of the poverty cycle. According to a report by the California Budget Project, *Working, but Poor in California* (September 1996), most of the children that grow up in poor families are less likely to complete school. The incompleteness of school basically leads to a life of poverty for the child once he or she becomes an adult. This cycle eventually repeats itself over the generations of the family, which only works to worsen the level of poverty in California. At the same time the report details how consistent reductions in AFDC benefits since 1989 have contributed to the difficulty faced by families trying to escape welfare and make the transition to full-time work. In order to support the healthy transition of families out of poverty and into the workforce, the report includes the recommendation that "public policies can help insure that poor families have access to services such as health coverage and child care (p. 36)."

By the mid 1990's, the number of people living in poverty in Los Angeles County had grown by 53% between 1980-1992, according to the Los Angeles County Child Care Advisory Board (Quality Child Care Committee, 1995). The Committee's report further established that 540 babies were born each day in Los Angeles County, increasing daily the County's desperate need to expand the availability of and access to quality child care services for the growing economically-disadvantaged sector of the population. This need was being accentuated, particularly given the fact that 21% of Los Angeles County's children were living in poverty and that large disparities existed in the range of quality of existing child care service providers.¹

According to a recent study on the Economic Impact of the Child Care Industry in Los Angeles County: Local Investment in Child Care (prepared by the National Economic Development and Law Center, June 1999), the industry of child care supports 34,000 local jobs and generates \$ 81.38 billion in gross receipts. This report further substantiates the particular significance of the child care industry for Los Angeles County, considering the following statistics it offers:

Los Angeles is the home of 8,297 child care establishments with a capacity for 240,073 children; yet, the County has a population of 9.6 million people, with children under 14 making up 23% of the county's total population and more than half (57%) of Los Angeles' children are considered low income. In addition, employment in Los Angeles County is projected to increase 27.6% in the next two decades by 2020; currently

¹ The report found 9% considered good, 56% adequate, and 35% inadequate or harmful (Quality Child Care Committee, 1995).

care capacity in the county through programs like CCTI and over 150 after school programs currently being operated through the Los Angeles Unified School District and the County Office of Education at high need schools that serve students from families on public assistance.

In a recent Policy Analysis for California Education report produced by the Growing Up in Poverty Project at the University of California, Berkley and Stanford University, (Fuller, et al. [PACE], August 2001) researchers found that "the allocation of child care subsidies remains linked to whether the mother (or caseworker) finds a center-based slot for the child. Fully 70% of the women who used a child care subsidy had selected a licensed care provider, usually a center-based program or pre-school." Furthermore, even though all women entering CalWORKs are eligible for child-care subsidies, provided that they commit to consistent engagement in job-searching activities, a relatively small percentage take advantage of this state subsidy: "21% of all (stage 1) CalWORKs clients in Los Angeles County assigned to a work activity were drawing a child-care subsidy in late 1999 (Fuller, et al., August 2001)." Researchers further identified problems accessing the quality of the child care being selected by lower income families who do access these subsidies, pointing out that it is particularly difficult to establish longitudinal interactions with home-based providers. Because limited information is available regarding the quality and character of home-based care, they recommend that such providers can be targeted through organized training efforts that encourage basic improvements in their care-giving (Fuller, et al., August 2001). This is precisely the charge taken on by the Child Care Training Institute in Los Angeles County.

The Child Care Training Institute of Los Angeles County Office of Education.

Based on the extensively documented need for alternatives to high cost child care for working poor families (as evidenced in the above literature review) and as part of the general trend in public policy to promote initiatives that foster public/private partnerships and inter-agency collaborations, on March 26, 1998, the County of Los Angeles Department of Public Services Board approved the allocation of 1.9 million dollars to the Capacity Development Expenditure Plan for CalWorks Child Care. Aimed at increasing the child care capacity in the county, the Plan called for DPSS to work in collaboration with the Department of Children and Family Services (DCSF), County Office of Education (LACOE), California Department of Social Services Community Care Licensing Division (CDSSCCLD), the Department of Human Resources (DHR), the Child Care Planning Committee, and other child care advocates (e.g. Foster Family Agencies, Legal Aid, Los Angeles County Child Care Planning Committee, Public Law Project, and Resource and Referral Agencies) in developing programs that achieve the following outcomes:

1. Recruit prospective family child care providers in high need areas
2. Maximize the supply and quality of child care services available to families by training current and new providers

Plan (included in this evaluation report) is the Start-Up Assistance Program (with a \$64,200 budget allocation), which entails the provision of a Child Care Start-Up Package to certain eligible participants in the CCTI workshops.

Since initiating its program in May of 1999, CCTI has provided 389 trainings to diverse child care providers in the county on topics relevant to both the start-up and management of a private child care business. Topics are chosen to develop a knowledge base among workshop participants on the best practices in the child care field. Workshop content is based on sound principles of the cognitive, social, and physical development of children and ways to organize care-taking environments and day care curriculum, as well as how to address specific needs of diverse children. Initially, program participants attended an orientation workshop intended to assist them in determining the degree to which they are genuinely interested in pursuing a career in child care. Once identified as having an interest, clients are offered the opportunity to attend any workshops in the series. CCTI workshops have been provided primarily in English, but numerous have been offered in Spanish, as well a few in Mandarin, Cantonese, Cambodian, and Armenian/Russian in an effort to outreach services into those linguistically diverse populations most in need of competent low-cost child care services. [For detailed information on number of workshops, topics and languages in which they were delivered, see Appendix 7: Training by Language, Topic, and Year of Participation.] Many participants in CCTI workshops have been licensed day care or family child care providers while others have received their license subsequent to participating in the trainings or at least report the intention of securing a license in the future. [See Table 7: Licensing Status of Participants Completing Evaluations and Appendix 8: Licensing Status by Language Groups.]

enrolled in a research practicum course at the University of California, Irvine (Education 199: Independent Research) who were supervised by Dr. Christensen. Students assisted the evaluators by carrying out the following research activities:

1. Review and write abstracts of relevant literature on child care training and service provision for CCTI's target population (This literature review and compiled bibliography is included in this final report.)
2. Attend and record observations of workshops offered by CCTI between October 2001 and May 2002
3. Input survey data into database

SURVEYS

Post-training evaluations had been collected by CCTI from the workshop participants since the introduction of the CCTI trainings in 1999. CCTI designed and administered these evaluation surveys as part of their ongoing program assessment and management strategies. [See Appendices 3 and 4: Examples of Post-Training Evaluation Forms.] Education 199 students participated in the development of a scoring rubric and inputted the survey data into a SPSS database. Subsequently, Dr. Christensen coded it for analysis. The process of inputting data began in January of 2002 and continued through June 2002. The coded and analyzed data include post-training workshop questionnaires; Start-Up Package surveys, and data collected from telephone surveys described below.

TELEPHONE INTERVIEWS

A random sample of survey respondents (every 10th person on sign in sheets of program participants) was used to conduct follow-up telephone surveys. The telephone surveys were designed by Ms. Araujo and Dr. Christensen and reviewed by Dr. O'Cadiz. The Education 199 students were trained in telephone interview protocol and were the ones to conduct most of the telephone interviews. Some interviews were conducted by Araujo and Christensen.

Furthermore, as part of their Education 199 seminar, students and evaluators met regularly to discuss the literature and to debrief on the workshop observations and telephone interviews. These formal discussions have significantly informed the evaluation process in that they served to facilitate the evaluators' triangulation among the child care literature, the CCTI survey, the Start-Up Package data, the telephone survey data, and the empirical observational data that the students provided.

DATA ANALYSIS

Data analysis was undertaken by a team of researchers from the University of California, Irvine.⁴ Lead Evaluator, Diane Pasillas Araujo, MPA, of Pasillas & Associates, Consultants, coordinated the evaluation effort. Pilar O'Cadiz, Ph.D., Executive Director of the University of California, Irvine Collaborative After School Project, conceptualized the theoretical and methodological framework for the evaluation. Research Coordinator Nancy Christensen, Ed.D., University of California, Irvine, led the team of UCI undergraduate researchers tasked with developing scoring rubrics, inputting and analyzing data using SPSS, developing and implementing the telephone survey, and conducting participant observations of selected trainings.

The undergraduate research team, drawn from students enrolled in UCI Education 199: Independent Research, brought several talents to the evaluation effort. All had participated in undergraduate education classes where they studied theories of learning and issues of multi-cultural education. Two of the members, Yanira Gale and Miri Son, were bi-lingual in Spanish and English, having grown up in Mexico and Ecuador, respectively. One member, Linda Wang, was bilingual in Mandarin and English and able to read Cantonese. Young (Paul) Kim was tri-lingual, fluent in Korean, English, and Portuguese. Rabya Asnar was fluent in English and Urdu, with working knowledge of several other languages of Pakistan. Rochelle Ruiz was fluent in Tagalog and English. Kim, Asnar, Ruiz, and the remaining members of the undergraduate research team, Don Kim, Rebecca Moon, Jae Yoon, and Crystal Jennings worked with English language data. All members had been admitted to Education 199: Independent Research as students with exceptional promise and demonstrated unusual dedication throughout the evaluation, meeting weekly from September 2001 through June 2002 to develop assessment documents, review data, discuss analysis, and share perspectives on the direction of the evaluation.

During the 12-month period from July 2001 through June 2002, five categories of Child Care Training Institute data were analyzed:

- Child Care literature, both historical and current, including a previous study of the Child Care Training Institute conducted by the Institute at Indian Hill and the School of Education Studies at Claremont Graduate School in 2000
- 8,597 evaluations completed by attendees at the end of their respective Child Care Training Workshop(s)

⁴ Analysis by teams and panels has been part of the research tradition in social science (Hakes, 1993; Murray and Hammons, 1995). Jorgensen (1989) considered undergraduate assistants particularly appropriate for specific tasks: "Like team research strategies, the use of research assistants may enhance the breadth and quality of data by providing multiple perspectives (66)." Bogdan and Biklen (1998) recognized that "more and more qualitative research ...is undertaken in teams (71)."

- Curriculum
- Discipline with Love
- Family Care
- High Scope
- Is Child Care for You? (Everything You Wanted To Know About Child Care But Were Afraid to Ask!)

Table 1 below summarizes the number of workshops per year for each language.

Table 1: Workshops by Language and Year

Language	From 5/4/99	2000	2001	To 2/23/02	Total
English	35	80	89	12	216
Spanish	25	42	59	11	137
Mandarin	-	4	6	2	12
Cantonese	-	3	5	2	10
Cambodian	2	-	-	-	2
Russian/Armenian	-	-	1	2	3
Total	62	129	160	29	380

Table 2 below summarizes the number of workshops per year by topic.

Table 2: Workshops by Topic and Year

Topic	From 5/4/99	2000	2001	1/1/02 to 2/23/02	Total
Legal Issues	14	21	21	2	58
Health and Safety	14	27	26	4	71
Business & Marketing	14	23	27	6	70
Activities & Understanding	20	35	25	4	84
CalWORKS	-	2	4	-	6
Special Needs	-	17	21	4	42
Being Your Best	-	3	9	1	13
Curriculum	-	-	2	-	2
Discipline with Love	-	-	14	5	19
Family Care	-	1	5	-	6
High Scope	-	-	2	-	2
Is Child Care for You?	-	-	4	3	7
Total	62	129⁷	160	29	380

⁷ One hundred thirty trainings were scheduled for 2000; the title of the Spanish Language training on October 31, 2000 is not known.

Table 5 below summarizes training attendance according to the language in which a given workshop was presented: English, Spanish, Mandarin, Cantonese, Cambodian, or Russian/Armenian. Tables 35 and 36 in Appendix 2 summarize data for the two largest language groups, English and Spanish, by year.

Table 5: Training Attendance by Language Group: 1999 - 2001

Language	Total #	Total Attend	Range	Mean	Median	Mode
English Language Trainings	202	5597	4-80	27.7	25	17
Spanish Language Trainings	128	3721	7 - 59	29	29	18
Mandarin Language Trainings	10	354	21-55	35.4	32	32
Cantonese Language Trainings	8	289	22 - 50	36	36	36
Cambodian Language Trainings	2	80	38-42	40	-	-
Russian/Armenian Language Trainings	1	44	-	-	-	-

At the end of each workshop, participants were encouraged to complete an evaluation form. The language on the evaluation form conformed to the language of the workshop. (See Appendix 3: Example of Post-Training Evaluation Forms, Version 1 for examples of the post-training evaluation forms in English, Spanish, and Mandarin/Cantonese.)

The evaluation form evolved over three years, with basic questions included in each version: topic, date, and location of workshop; licensing status of participant; ethnic identification (optional); and participant evaluation of the training. Version 2 of the evaluation form added questions asking participants to rate the usefulness of the group activity and the handouts and asked if they would be changing how they provided child care because of their participation in the training (see Appendix 4: Examples of Post-Training Evaluation Forms, Version 2 for examples of the post-training evaluation forms in English, Spanish, and Mandarin/Cantonese).

This study looked at evaluations covering the period May 4, 1999 through December 15, 2001. During this time period, 8,597 evaluations were available to the research team for analysis. (See Appendix 5: Training Evaluation Data Table.)

A scoring rubric was created to enter data from the evaluation forms into SPSS (See Appendix 6: Training Evaluation Scoring Rubric). Data was examined from three perspectives: for all participants, for each language group, and by year.

Attendance at Workshops

Data from the evaluations examined for this study revealed overall training attendance per topic was strongest for *Activities and Understanding*, one of the original four topics when trainings were initiated in 1999. Topics added more recently recorded lower overall attendance. Table 6 below summarizes the frequency of participation by language group in the twelve training topics offered from May 1999 through December

Response to Workshop

A. Initial questionnaires asked participants to rate the value and organization of the training and the effectiveness of the presenters. Participants reported very favorable reactions to the value of the trainings. 4413 (88%) of the 5034 respondents rated the value of the training "Excellent;" 4937 (98%) rated the value "Good" or "Excellent." Table 8 below summarizes the overall findings from participants' ratings for the trainings. Appendix 9: Rating of Training Value by Language Group and Year presents data organized by language group.

Table 8: Value of the Training, Version 1

N = 5034 The value of the workshop was:	From 5/4/99	2000	2001	Total
1 - Poor	-	2	1	3
2	1	10	3	14
3	35	32	13	80
4	231	253	40	524
5 - Excellent	1673	2455	285	4413

Participants completing evaluation forms tended to rate the organization of the training "Excellent" (84%); 4,839 (97%) of the respondents rated the organization "Excellent" or "Good." Table 9 presents the overall findings; Appendix 10: Rating of Organization of Training by Language Group and Year presents data organized by language group.

Table 9: Organization of the Training, Version 1

N = 4975 The organization of the training was:	From 5/4/99	2000	2001	Total
1 - Poor	1	3	3	7
2	5	12	3	20
3	41	47	21	109
4	282	341	38	661
5 - Excellent	1587	2314	277	4178

2. *Group activity was useful.*

Two thousand three hundred and forty (89%) of the 2,618 respondents marked that they "*Strongly Agree*" that the group activity was useful; 2,544 (97%) selected either "*Strongly Agree*" or "*Agree*."

Table 12: Usefulness of Group Activity, Version 2

N = 2293	
Choices	2001
Strongly Disagree	40
Disagree	8
Neutral	26
Agree	204
Strongly Agree	2340

3. *The handouts were useful.*

Two thousand four hundred and sixty-six (93%) of the 2,643 respondents marked that they "*Strongly Agree*" that the handouts distributed during the training were useful; 2,588 (98%) selected either "*Strongly Agree*" or "*Agree*."

Table 13: Usefulness of Handouts, Version 2

N = 2,306	
Choices	2001
Strongly Disagree	45
Disagree	1
Neutral	9
Agree	122
Strongly Agree	2466

4. *The presenter was effective.*

Two thousand four hundred eighty-nine (94%) of the 2,639 respondents marked that they "*Strongly Agree*" that the presenter was effective; 2,583 (98%) selected either "*Strongly Agree*" or "*Agree*."

Table 14: Effectiveness of Presenter, Version 2

N = 2305	
Choices	2001
Strongly Disagree	48
Disagree	2
Neutral	6
Agree	94
Strongly Agree	2489

year and were most heavily attended during the summer months. (See Appendix 13: Distribution of attendance by month.)

III. Data from Evaluation of Start-Up Packages

Workshop participants who completed two workshops, at least one of which must be a Building Quality Child Care workshop (*Health and Safety Issues and Communicating with Parents, Activities and Understanding Each Child's Unique Needs*); who had secured their child care license; and who had a combined household income for a family of four of \$ 2,781 per month or below qualified for the Los Angeles County Office of Education Child Care Training Institute Start-Up Package. The package provided up to \$250.00 worth of materials to support a child care operation, including child care manuals, children's books, puzzles, games, counting beads, wrist bells, parachute, cars, art supplies, mats, and a first aid kit.

Recipients of the Start-Up Package completed an evaluation identifying their licensing status, zip code, the various Child Care Trainings they had attended, the type of child care they were providing, and their agreement/disagreement with a series of statements describing the Start-Up Package. The research team examined 182 evaluations that had been completed by recipients of the Start-up Package. One hundred and thirteen of the evaluations were completed by English Language speakers. Fifty of the evaluations were completed by Spanish Language speakers. Nineteen of the evaluations were completed by Mandarin or Cantonese Language speakers. Members of the research team fluent in the respective languages analyzed the English, Spanish, Mandarin, and Cantonese Language evaluations. Data was entered into SPSS using a scoring rubric designed by the research team. (See Appendix 14: Start-Up Package Evaluation Form and Scoring Rubric.) Results of the analysis of data from the Start-Up Package Evaluations are presented below.

Status of Licensing

One hundred seventy-eight participants, representing 97.8% of the recipients, reported that they were a licensed child care provider. The remaining 2.2% did not provide an answer to the question.

Table 18 below summarizes frequency of participation in the individual workshops reported by recipients of the Start-Up Package.

Table 18: Workshop Participation by Start-up Package Recipients

Name of Workshop	English N = 110	Spanish N = 48	Mandarin Cantonese N = 18	Total N = 176
Be The Best That You Can Be	25	19	12	56
Activities and Understanding Each Child's Unique Needs	86	45	15	146
Health and Safety Issues and Communicating with Parents	94	39	16	149
Business and Marketing	80	39	15	134
Discipline With Love	21	25	13	59
Legal Issues	64	36	17	117
Understanding CalWORKs Child Care	21	17	12	50
Working with Special Needs Children	50	25	14	89
Everything You Wanted To Know About Child Care But Were Afraid to Ask! (Is Child Care For You?) ¹²	2	2	-	4
Total	443	247	114	804

Child Care Being Provided at Time of Survey

One hundred sixty-six (91%) of the 182 Start-Up Package recipients reported they were providing child care in their home at the time of the survey. Table 19 summarizes the responses by language groups.

Table 19: Caring for Children at Time of Start-Up Package Survey

<i>As of today, are you currently providing child care in your home?</i>	English	Spanish	Mandarin Cantonese	Total
Yes	104	45	17	166
No	5	-	2	7
Did Not Answer	4	5	-	9

¹²Beginning in 2002 the Start-Up Package Evaluations added the workshop category: *Everything You Wanted To Know About Child Care But Were Afraid to Ask! (aka: Is Child Care For You?)*. This category was included on 20 of the 110 English language evaluations and seven of the 48 Spanish language evaluations.

Fifth Supervisorial District. Two zip codes had five Start-up Package recipients: 90220 in the Second District and 90550 in the Fifth District. Fifty-eight packages were earned by recipients in the Top 50 High Need Zip Codes (identified by Cal WORKs, 3/1999). An additional 37 fell within the 51 to 102 ranking of CalWORKs High Need Zip Codes. Appendix 15: Start-Up Package Distribution by Zip Code, Supervisorial District, and Language Group lists by language groups the zip codes of recipients, the number of recipients in each zip code, and the ranking of the zip code on CalWORKs High Need Zip Codes Priority Order.

Recipient Responses on Start-Up Package Survey

On the Start-Up Package Survey, recipients were asked to indicate the degree of their agreement or disagreement with four statements. Two statements expressed a positive opinion about the Start-Up Package; the other two were positive statements about the Training Workshops. Tables 22 and 23 present data about participant response to the Start-Up Package. Tables 24 and 25 present data about participant response to the workshops they attended.

Statement 1. The Start-up Package was useful for my family daycare.

One hundred fifty-four (85%) of the 182 recipients reported that they "Strongly Agree" that the Start-Up Package was useful for their family day care; 167 (91%) selected either "Agree" or "Strongly Agree."

Table 22: Usefulness of Start-Up Package

<i>The Start-Up Package was useful for my family daycare.</i> Choices	English N = 113	Spanish N = 50	Mandarin Cantonese N = 19	Total N = 182
No response	4	2	1	7
1 - Strongly Disagree	4	1	-	5
2	2	-	-	2
3 - Neither Agree no Disagree	-	1	-	1
4	11	1	1	13
5 - Strongly Agree	92	45	17	154

Statement 2. The Start-up Package is beneficial and should be continued for participants who complete requirements.

One hundred sixty-five (90%) of the 182 recipients reported that they "Strongly Agree" that the Start-Up Package was beneficial and should be continued; 168 (91%) selected either "Agree" or "Strongly Agree."

Ranking of Materials Provided in Start-Up Package

Recipients were asked to rank from 1 (*Most Useful*) to 12 (*Least Useful*) the materials they received in the Start-Up Package. The more popular items were the First Aid kit, art supplies, and children's books. Table 26 below summarizes the rankings given to each item.¹³ Appendix 16: Rankings Given by Recipients to Materials in Start-Up Package presents this information by language group.

Key: 1 = Most Useful
12 = Least Useful

Table 26: Rankings given by Recipients to Start-Up Package Materials

Item	Ranking	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
Child Care Manuals	72	10	14	4	6	5	5	3	10	10	6	14	
Children's Books	91	6	9	11	4	5	3	3	1	6	1	10	
Soft Books/Musical Moon	73	9	8	6	7	6	6	9	6	4	3	16	
Sorting & Counting Beads	73	15	9	4	10	6	6	7	7	8	5	9	
Wrist Bells	69	9	9	8	6	7	6	3	10	8	10	16	
Parachute	70	10	5	6	8	9	1	3	4	12	8	20	
Art Supplies	96	13	17	8	7	3	4	4	-	2	2	12	
Cars	73	15	9	7	6	3	3	14	7	11	8	11	
First Aid Kit	96	11	3	6	-	1	2	1	3	1	2	15	
Mats	12	13	5	1	4	2	1	-	-	3	4	14	
Puzzles	64	14	11	6	15	5	9	4	1	7	5	11	
Farm Animals	77	13	10	10	3	5	8	6	5	12	5	11	

Recipients were asked if the Start Up Package should remain as it is. One hundred twenty eight (88%) of the 146 respondents answered "Yes."

Table 27: Recipient Recommendations for Composition of Future Start-Up Packages

Should the Start-Up Package remain as it is?	English N = 98	Spanish N = 29	Mandarin Cantonese N = 19	Total N = 146
Yes	88 90%	29 100%	11 58%	128 88%
No	10 10%	-	8 42%	18 12%

Suggestions for changes to the package included: adding cassettes with children's songs; game books for different ages; numbers, ABCs, and flash cards to help pre-school age

¹³ It should be noted that some participants used one number value for more than one item. Others ranked the materials from 1 to 12. Still others ranked materials numerically but did not use all of the numbers. The responses reflect these variations.

IV. Telephone Interviews

From March through May 2002, the research team conducted a telephone survey of a sampling of Child Care Training Institute workshop participants. From a master roster of sign-in sheets, every tenth name was selected for the interview pool. From this pool, the research team identified 614 trainees for interviewing.

The telephone survey followed the procedures and recommendations developed by qualitative researcher Don A. Dillman (1978, 1994). To standardize the questions asked of the interviewees, an English Language protocol was developed and subsequently translated into Spanish and Mandarin. (See Appendix 17: Protocol for Telephone Survey.) Telephone interviews were conducted in English, Spanish, and Mandarin by research team members fluent in the designated language.

During the three-month interview period when the 614 calls were attempted, researchers made a maximum three attempts to reach each person, calling a number up to three different times: in the morning, afternoon, and weekend. Table 29 below summarizes the contact information for the telephone survey. Appendix 18: Distribution of Number Assignments for Telephone Interviewees lists the distribution of interview pool numbers for the people who were interviewed.

Table 29: Telephone Survey Contact

Action	English	Spanish	Mandarin Cantonese	Total
Number of telephone calls attempted	303	278	33	614
No telephone number available on roster	3	8	-	11
Telephone number disconnected	43	18	15	76
Telephone number did not answer	10	53	-	63
Telephone number was wrong number	43	17	1	61
Reached an answering machine; no interview conducted	77	50	2	129
Reached a Fax machine	1	-	-	1
Answered but already had been interviewed ¹⁴	7	6	-	13
Answered: worked for workshop	2	-	-	2
Answered but not correct person	8	1	-	9
Answered but spoke a language different from the interviewer	7	-	-	7
Answered and asked interviewer to call back; no interview conducted	10	35	-	45
Answered but did not want to be interviewed	37	-	-	37
Workshop participant deceased	1	-	-	1
Interview successfully conducted	54	90	15	159

¹⁴ Since workshop participants often attended more than one training, some of the people who were contacted already had been interviewed by another researcher.

Table 31: Attendance at Child Care Training Institute Workshops

Categories of Answers	Number of Responses	% of Interviewees N = 159
Legal Issues	84	53%
Health and Safety	103	65%
Business and Marketing	104	65%
Activities and Understanding	108	68%
CalWORKs	13	8%
Special Needs	82	52%
Being the Best You Can Be	46	29%
Curriculum	14	9%
Discipline with Love	86	54%
Family Care	21	13%
High Scope	5	3%
Is Child Care for You?/Everything You Always Wanted To Know About Child Care But Were Afraid to Ask!	34	21%

Question: Which workshop did you like the best?

Interviewees were asked which workshop they liked the best. One hundred thirteen people responded. The most popular workshop was *Special Needs* followed by *Discipline with Love*. Table 32 below summarizes the responses for the ten workshops that were identified.

Table 32: Favorite Child Care Training Institute Workshop

Categories of Answers	Number of Responses	% of Interviewees N = 113
Legal Issues	10	9%
Health and Safety	12	11%
Business and Marketing	10	9%
Activities and Understanding	14	12%
CalWORKs	1	.8%
Special Needs	21	19%
Being the Best You Can Be	7	6%
Curriculum	2	1.7%
Discipline with Love	18	16%
Family Care	-	-
High Scope	-	-
Is Child Care for You?/Everything You Always Wanted To Know About Child Care But Were Afraid to Ask!	3	2.6%
All of them	15	13%

Would you attend other Child Care Training Institute workshops?

One hundred fifty-three (96%) of the interviewees indicated they would attend other workshops.

Summation

The 159 former workshop participants who were interviewed had learned about the Child Care Training Institute workshops from a variety of sources. One hundred and ten reported that they were licensed; 28 who were not licensed indicated they were pursuing licensing. One hundred and nineteen of the interviewees were caring for children. The interviewees had attended multiple workshops and expressed strong interest in attending additional workshops.

V. Participant Observation of Workshops

From October 2001 through May 2002, members of the research team attended ten Child Care Training Institute workshops, one in Mandarin (*Discipline Children with Love*); five in Spanish (*Business and Marketing*, *Discipline [3]*, and *Activities*); and four in English (*Business and Marketing*, *Activities and Understanding [2]*, and *Legal Issues*). Researchers observed the workshop setting, participants, presenter, structure of the presentation, and supporting workshop materials and identified components of the workshop which the researcher thought contributed substantially to successful training.

Five of the workshop reports are presented in Appendix 19. In general, the researchers were impressed with the content and the presentation of the workshops. Trainers exhibited best practices in adult learning theory by establishing rapport with the participants and encouraging sharing and networking. The presentations were well organized and supported with numerous materials that the participants took with them. Through informal conversations with other attendees, the presenters learned that participants had attended several other workshops, were very appreciative that this resource was available, and were looking forward to attending additional workshops.

The final section of this report offers some recommendations for program development and future, more in-depth assessment of the quality of CCTI training and support services and a clearer determination of the general impact and specific outcomes of the CCTI program with regard to fomenting the availability and improving the quality of child care services for those children and families who most need them.

Based on an analysis of the data collected regarding participants un-met needs, programmatic recommendations include the following:

1. The establishment of an Information Hotline where participants can easily access information and technical assistance in their own child care service improvement efforts that are spurred by their ongoing professional development process that CCTI workshops intentionally provoke (e.g., many survey respondents voiced a need for assistance in recruiting child care clients).
2. A broadening of workshop topics based on recent research findings on the cognitive, social, and cultural development of children as recommended by the newly revised 2001 NAEYC Standards for Early Childhood Professional Preparation—which call for “an even greater focus on academic content, cultural, and linguistic diversity, and young children with special needs.” For example,
 - a) workshop sessions that focus on the use of music to stimulate children’s cognitive development (particularly effective with special needs children)
 - b) games and play activities that foment math and scientific inquiry skills as part of a general school readiness role that any child care provider should and can fulfill
 - c) specific workshops aimed at developing cross-cultural competencies among child care professionals.
3. Development of a process for awarding individuals participating in workshops with continuing education units or college credits (as indicated in the initial CCTI Proposal, 1998); in addition, establish either an independent child care specialization certificate program or coordinate with existing certification programs such as the Child Development Permit currently required by the California Department of Education for child care professionals who work in state licensed facilities serving children from birth to kindergarten and the Child Development Permit with a School-Age Emphasis authorizing the holder to work in settings serving children and youths from birth to age fourteen (CDE, 1999).

Some workshop topics that may assist in continued capacity building include cross-cultural training and those that inform participants about studies on cognitive learning of children from 0-3 years old. These should emphasize math, music, and science as expanded upon in the recommendations section. Pre-test and post-test surveys are proposed to more specifically inform the research regarding knowledge base development of participating adult learners.

Lastly, the Child Care Training Institute has created a strong following in both the Latino and Chinese communities by providing relevant and linguistically-suited people and materials for which participants stated their "extreme appreciation." CCTI has positioned the program with an audience poised and ready for more. In conclusion, our final recommendation is to formalize the network of community links and establish an "Information Hotline" giving those who need child care and those who provide quality child care an opportunity to connect with one another. Linking each of these populations with a continually updated information on trainings, employment opportunities and local providers may allow for more and better child care services.

Dillman, D. (1978). Mail and Telephone Surveys: the Total Design Method. New York: Wiley.

Dillman, D. & Salant, P. (1994). How to Conduct Your Own Survey. New York: Wiley.

Fuller, B. et al. (August 2001). Child-Care Aid and Quality for California Families: Focusing on San Francisco and Santa Clara Counties. Policy Analysis for California Education, Growing Up in Poverty Project. University of California Berkley, Teachers College, Columbia University, and Yale University.

Growing Up in Poverty Project (August 2001). Child-Care Aid and Quality for California Families: Focusing on San Francisco and Santa Clara Counties. Berkeley, Ca: Policy Analysis for California Education.

Growing Up in Poverty Project (August 2001). Preschool and Child-Care Quality in California Neighborhoods: Policy Success, Remaining Gaps. Berkeley, Ca: Policy Analysis for California Education.

Growing Up in Poverty Project (November 1997). The Effects of Welfare Reform on Children. Berkeley & Stanford, Ca: California Child Care Resource & Referral Network and Yale University PACE Center.

Hakes, B. (1993). Using compressed video to coach/mentor distant teacher interns. University of Wyoming, ERIC Document No. ED356224.

Hubner, J.J. (1980). Day Care for Children in California: Regulations and Needs. Sacramento, Ca: State Department of Finance.

Imel, S. (1998). Using Adult Learning Principles in Adult Basic and Literacy Education. ERIC Clearinghouse on Adult, Career, and Vocational Education. Columbus, Ohio: Ohio State University Center on Education and Training For Employment.

Jorgensen, D.L. (1989). Participant Observation: A Methodology for Human Studies. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Kagan, S. & Cohen, N. (1997). Not By Chance. Creating an Early Care and Education System for America's Children. The Quality 2000 Initiative. Yale University, New Haven, CT: The Bush Center in Child Development and Social Policy.

Kagan, S., Goffin, S., Golub, S. & Pritchard, E. (1995). Toward Systemic Reform: Service Integration for Young Children and Their Families. Falls Church, VA: National Center for Service Integration.

Tebb, K.P. (1997). Thoughtful Reflections for Future Directions: the Los Angeles County Child Care Oral History. Los Angeles, Ca: Los Angeles County Child Care Advisory.

The National Center for the Early Childhood Work Force (1995). A Profile of the Child Care Center Work Force in Los Angeles County, California. Washington, D.C.: The National Center for the Early Childhood Work Force.

Appendix 1

Location and Frequency of Use of Training Workshop Sites May 4, 1999 through December 31, 2001

Key:	ACRC	African Community Resource Center
	A3PCON	Asian Pacific Policy and Planning Council
	BASE	Basic Adult Spanish Education
	CCRC	Child Care Resource Center
	CFS	Child and Family Service
	CHLA	Children's Hospital of Los Angeles
	CHSAP	Community Housing Services Alternative Program
	LACOE	Los Angeles County Office of Education
	MAOF	Mexican American Opportunity Foundation

Table 34: Location and Frequency of Use of Training Workshop Sites

Site	1999 From 5/4/99	2000	2001	Total
ACRC	-	5	-	5
Antelope Valley College	-	-	4	4
A3PCON	-	3	-	3
Banning Recreation Center	-	3	-	3
BASE	-	1	-	1
Bellflower Brethren	-	-	1	1
Carson Community Center	-	-	11	11
Casa Loma	4	-	-	4
CCRC - Lancaster	-	-	4	4
CFS	-	10	8	18
Children's Institute International	2	2	3	7
CHLA	-	5	10	15
CHSAP	4	1	-	5
Crystal Stairs	1	-	-	1
Dolores Mission	-	-	11	11
Duff School	-	7	-	7
East Los Angeles College	2	-	-	2
Edison: Rosemead	-	2	-	2
El Camino Family Agency	-	1	-	1
E Monte	-	-	7	7
Estrada Courts	-	5	2	7
Equipoise	-	4	-	4
Exposition Park	1	-	-	1
Faithful Central	-	4	1	5
1 st Church of God	-	1	-	1
Gibson School	-	6	-	6
Glendale USD	-	-	1	1
Good Beginnings	-	1	-	1
Harbor Gateway	-	2	-	2
Hilton/Glendale	-	-	4	4
Hollywood United Methodist	-	-	2	2

APPENDIX 2

ATTENDANCE AT ENGLISH AND SPANISH LANGUAGE TRAININGS BY YEAR

APPENDIX 3

EXAMPLES OF POST-TRAINING EVALUATION FORMS COMPLETED BY TRAINING ATTENDEES

VERSION 1

ENGLISH FORM

SPANISH FORM

MANDARIN/CANTONESE FORM

CHILD CARE TRAINING INSTITUTE

Título de la clase derechos y Guarderías Fecha 4 4.99Lugar Child & Family ServicesNombre del presentador Belén Vargas

Por favor, díganos algo acerca de sí mismo:

☐ Proporciono cuidado infantil con licencia
cuidado☐ Proporciono

sin licencia

☐ Personal de un centro de cuidado infantil autorizado☒ En vías de obtener
una licencia de
cuidado infantilOrigen étnico/cultural Guatemala

Por favor califique los siguientes aspectos de la conferencia (enciérre uno con un círculo).

	Malo				Excelente
	1	2	3	4	5
La calidad del taller fue:					<u>5</u>
La organización de la capacitación fue:					<u>5</u>
La eficacia del presentador fue:					<u>5</u>

Comentarios:

muchas Felicidades nos Facilitar
los procedimientos y nos dan fuerza
a seguir adelante porque tenemos
su apoyo que Dios les Bendiga

GRACIAS POR COMPARTIR SUS IMPRESIONES CON NOSOTROS

Good support for having
these workshops.

APPENDIX 4

**EXAMPLES OF POST-TRAINING EVALUATION FORMS
COMPLETED BY TRAINING ATTENDEES
VERSION 2
ENGLISH FORM
SPANISH FORM
MANDARIN/CANTONESE FORM**

Oficina de Educación del Condado de Los Angeles
Instituto de Entrenamiento para el Cuidado de Niños

Evaluación

Disciplinando a los
Nombre del taller niños con amor Fecha 10 de noviembre del 2001
Localidad Children's Hospital Los Angeles Presentador/a Maricarmen Zequiera-Chandler

Por favor, díganos acerca de usted (*marque uno*):

- ☐ Proveedor de cuidados con licencia ☐ Proveedor de cuidados sin licencia
☐ Miembro de personal de cuidados de niños con licencia ☐ A punto de recibir la licencia de cuidados de niños
☐ Recibí la licencia después de asistir a los talleres ☐ Otro _____

Código postal donde provee cuidado de niños _____

Por favor circule el número que indica su acuerdo con las siguientes declaraciones:

	<i>Totalmente en desacuerdo</i>	<i>Ni de Acuerdo o en desacuerdo</i>	<i>Totalmente de acuerdo</i>		
1. La información presentada en el taller fue útil.	1	2	3	4	5
2. Las actividades de grupo y las discusiones fueron útiles.	1	2	3	4	5
3. Los volantes de información que recibí fueron útiles.	1	2	3	4	5
4. El/La instructor/a tenía mucho conocimiento y fue muy efectivo/a.	1	2	3	4	5
5. En general, el taller estuvo conforme a mis necesidades.	1	2	3	4	5

Por favor conteste a las siguientes preguntas:

1. ¿Cual fue la información de mas valor que recibió en este taller?

2. ¿Cual fue la información de menos valor que recibió en este taller?

3. Estoy interesado/a en asistir a mas talleres. ☐ Si ☐ No

4. ¿Acerca de que le gustaría aprender mas?

Agradecemos cualquier comentario adicional. Favor de usar el reverso de este papel para escribir sus comentarios.

APPENDIX 5

TRAININGS EVALUATION DATA TABLE

21	8/21/99	King Drew Medical Cntr			Legal Issues	Vargas	Spanish		47	45	NC
22	8/28/99	St. Anne's			Activities	De La Torre	English		29	29	DK
23	8/28/99	St. Anne's			Activities	De La Torre	Spanish		42	40	NC
24	9/11/99	St. Anne's			Legal Issues	Vargas	Spanish		52	45	NC
25	9/18/99	CHSAP			Health & Safety	Portenberg	English		39	36	DK
26	9/18/99	White Memorial Hosp			Health & Safety	Anderson	Spanish		53	46	NC
27	9/18/99	King Drew Medical			Activities	Montgomery	English		27	24	DK
28	9/21/99	St. Anne's			Business	Bergquist	English		26	10	MS
29	9/25/99	King Drew Medical			Activities	Avila	Spanish		11	11	NC
30	9/25/99	Northridge Hospital			Business	Sandoval	Spanish		28	29	NC
31	9/25/99	Northridge Hospital			Business	Bergquist	English		25	23	NC
32	9/25/99	Redeemer			Business	Callahan	English		60	58	NC
33	9/25/99	Pomona			Health & Safety	Gunn	English		28	28	NC
34	10/6/99	St. Anne's			Business	Sandoval	Spanish		11	12	YG
35	10/9/99	King Drew Medical			Health & Safety	Anderson	Spanish		14	11	YG
36	10/9/99	Pomona			Legal Issues	Vargas	English		16	11	MS
37	10/12/99	St. Mary's			Legal Issues	Vargas	Cambodian		38	38	DK
38	10/16/99	Redeemer			Health & Safety	Bencivengo	English		54	47	NC
39	10/16/99	St. Anne's			Health & Safety	Mitchell	English		25	23	NC
40	10/16/99	White Memorial Hosp			Activities	Avila	Spanish		29	29	YG
41	10/23/99	King Drew Medical			Business	Callahan	English		54	49	DK
42	10/23/99	Crystal Stairs			Business	Sandoval	English		27	27	DK
43	10/30/99	Northridge Hospital			Health & Safety	Anderson	Spanish		24	23	YG
44	10/30/99	Northridge Hospital			Health & Safety	Portenberry	English		20	19	DK
45	11/6/99	White Memorial			Business	Sandoval	Spanish		39	37	YG
46	11/8/99	Casa Loma			Legal Issues	Vargas	Spanish		51	47	YG
47	11/13/99	Northridge Hospital			Activities	Montgomery	English		12	12	NC
48	11/13/99	Northridge Hospital			Activities	Avila	Spanish		21	24	YG
49	11/13/99	CHSAP			Legal Issues	Atkins	English		56	41	DK
50	11/20/99	St. Anne's			Health & Safety	Anderson	Spanish		24	26	YG
51	11/20/99	King Drew Medical			Health & Safety	Portenberry	English		54	52	DK
52	12/4/99	King Drew Medical			Activities	Montgomery	English		40	41	DK
53	12/4/99	King Drew Medical			Activities	Montgomery	English		31	28	DK
54	12/5/99	White Memorial Hosp			Activities	Avila	Spanish		29	28	YG
55	12/4/99	St. Margaret's			Activities	Marus	Spanish		21	21	YG
56	12/6/99	Casa Loma			Activities	Avila	Spanish		47	47	YG
57	12/11/99	Northridge Hospital			Legal Issues	Bailer	English		16	16	MS
58	12/11/99	Victory Outreach			Activities	Anderson	English		12	12	DK
59	12/11/99	St. Anne's			Health & Safety	Portenberry	English		27	22	DK
60	12/14/99	St. Mary's			Activities	De La Torre	Cambodian		42	39	DK

101	4/29/00	Estrada Courts		Activities	Avila	Spanish	25	20	16	MS
102	4/29/00	Inter'l Institute of LA		Health & Safety	Kwok	Mandarin	23	22	21	LW
103	5/06/00	Duff School		Business	Sandoval	English		33	31	RM
104	5/06/00	St. Francis		Legal Issues	Vargas	Spanish		28	28	YG
105	5/06/00	St. Mary's		Activities	Marks	English	56	36	34	RM
106	5/11/00	Harbor Gateway		Activities	De La Torre	English		22	21	YP
107	6/13/00	Northridge		Business	Sandoval	Spanish		19	13	MS
108	5/13/00	MAOF		Special Needs	Gonzalez	Spanish	64	33	33	YG
109	5/17/00	Equipoise		Business	Sandoval	English		43	42	MS
110	5/20/00	Gibson		Special Needs	Gonzalez	English		25	20	YP
111	5/20/00	St. Francis		Health	English	Sanders		24	26	YP
112	5/25/00	Kaiser Harbor City		Special Needs	Tucker	English		19	15	YP
113	6/3/00	St. Francis		Legal Issues	Bailer	English		32	24	YP
114	6/3/00	St. Francis		Being Your Best	Bello	English		46	47	MS
115	6/3/00	Duff School		Activities - Cancelled						
116	6/10/00	Gibson School		Activities	Marks	English		23	23	YP
117	6/10/00	St. Francis		Special Needs	Romero	English		34	27	YP
118	6/17/00	St. Mary's		Activities	Montgomery	English		29	25	YP
119	6/17/00	Northridge		Activities	De La Torre	English		26	24	YP
120	6/17/00	Edison		Special Needs	Gonzalez	Spanish		27	16	YG
121	6/24/00	CFS		Activities	Montgomery	English		53	40	YP
122	6/24/00	Equipoise		Business & Marketing	Sandoval	English		32	23	YP
123	6/24/00	Equipoise		Activities	Allen	English		17	16	YP
124	6/24/00	Inter'l Institute of LA		Activities	Tseng	Mandarin		32	28	LW
125	7/08/00	Duff		Special Needs	Tucker	English	23	14	12	YP
126	7/08/00	ACRC		Health	Montgomery	English	40	23	17	TP
127	7/15/00	CHLA		Legal Issues	Belen	Spanish	52	30	30	MS
128	7/15/00	RFK M.C.		Business	Sandoval	English	54	34	25	YP
129	7/22/00	CFS		Health	Chagolian	Spanish		22	23	MS
130	7/22/00	SDA Palmdale		Being Your Best	Vincent	English		12	10	YP
131	7/22/00	A3PCON		Business	Kwan	Cantonese		50	40	LW
132	7/22/00	Northridge		Business & Marketing	Sandoval	English		26	26	YP
133	7/22/00	Faithful Central		Health & Safety	Fortenberry	English		51	41	YP
134	7/29/00	MAOF		Business & Marketing	Sandoval	Spanish		41	36	YG
135	7/29/00	LACOE		Activities	Montgomery	English		24	24	RA
136	7/29/00	RFK M.C.		Activities	Avila	Spanish		44	43	YG
137	8/05/00	Duff		Health	Chagolian	English		24	20	RA
138	8/05/00	CHLA		Activities	Avila	Spanish		30	30	YG
139	8/05/00	RFK M.C.		Activities	Allen	English		40	34	RA
140	8/12/00	ACRC		Business	Sandoval	English		21	21	RA

181	10/28/00	Northridge				Legal Issues	Baier	English	33	9		
182	10/28/00	Victory Outreach				Health	Sanders	English	14	5		
183	10/31/00	BASE					Viramontes	Spanish		43		
184	11/04/00	RFK M.C.				Legal Issues	Atkin	English	42	31		
185	11/04/00	ACRC				Special Needs	Tucker	English	29	22		
186	11/04/00	Intern'l Institute of LA				Activities	Kwok	Cantonese	39	36		
187	11/15/00	Rio Hondo College				Activities	De La Torre	English	37	24		
188	11/18/00	CFS				Business	Sandoval	English	42	27		
189	11/18/00	Palmdale				Health	Wyatt	English	16	5		
190	12/02/00	Northridge				Activities	De La Torre	English	14	14		
191	12/09/00	RFK M.C.				Legal	Vargas	Spanish	21	14		
192	12/09/00	Palmdale SDA				Activities	Montgomery	English	12	4		
193	12/09/00	CHLA				Activities	Avila	Spanish	49	35		
194	12/09/00	RFK M.C.				Health	Fortenberry	English	45	38		
195	12/13/00	Rio Hondo College				Legal Issues	Baier	English	20	25		
196	1/16/01	Dolores Mission School				Being the Best	Bello	English	61	25	20	MS
197	1/20/01	CHLA				Special Needs	Cunningham	Spanish	47	44	38	MS
198	1/20/01	Faithful Central				Health	Sanders	English	52	28	26	MS
199	1/20/01	LACOE				Business	Glover	English	32	28	27	MS
200	1/20/01	St. Luke's				Legal Issues	Baier	English	46	20	19	MS
201	1/27/01	Bellflower Brethren				Activities	Allen	English	35	11	21	MS
202	1/27/01	Estrada Courts				Health	Chagolian	Spanish	57	18	11	MS
203	1/27/01	MAOF				Legal Issues	Public Counsel	Spanish	77	34	32	YG
204	2/03/01	Hilton-Glendale				CalWORKs	CFS	English	36	58	36	RM
205	2/03/01	Hilton-Glendale				CalWORKs	CFS	Cantonese	36	36	34	LW
206	2/03/01	Hilton-Glendale				CalWORKs	CRS	Mandarin	23	21	30	LW
207	2/03/01	Hilton-Glendale				CalWORKs	CFS	Spanish	62	54	52	MIR
208	2/10/01	LACOE				Activities	Avila	Spanish	54	29	31	YG
209	2/17/01	Estrada Courts				Business	Sandoval	Spanish	47	25	25	JY
210	2/20/01	Dolores Mission				Health	Chagolian	English	20	35	33	JY
211	2/22/01	LACOE				Special Needs	Cunningham	Spanish	38	9	9	YG
212	2/24/01	LA Conservation Corp				Curriculum	Sutterlin	English	28	27	25	YG
213	2/24/01	LACOE				Business	Glover	English	46	26	26	JY
214	2/24/01	LACOE				Legal Issues	Public Counsel	English	36	19	22	JY
215	2/24/01	MAOF				Health	Chagolian	Spanish	60	33	31	YG
216	2/24/01	Northridge M.C.				Special Needs	Tucker	English	23	16	16	JY
217	3/03/01	El Monte				Activities	Avila	Spanish	23	21	19	YG
218	3/03/01	Carson Community Cntr				Health	Fortenberry	English	46	35	36	JY
218	3/10/01	Intern's Institute				Special Needs	Yu/Fong	Mandarin	57	55	55	LW
220	3/10/01	LA Conservation Corp				Curriculum	Sutterlin	English	41	24	3	JY

261	6/02/01	Carson Community Cntr		Business	Glover	English	61	35	38	JY
262	6/09/01	CHLA		Being the Best	Bello	Spanish	52	35	34	YG
263	6/09/01	LACOE		Health	Fortenberry	English	65	43	42	JY
264	6/16/01	St. Luke's		Discipline	Tucker	English	35	15	15	RM
265	6/16/01	LACOE		Family Care	Green/Wyatt	English	58	34	33	JY
266	6/16/01	Northridge		Activities	Avila	Spanish	49	38	37	YG
267	6/20/01	LACOE		Business	Sandoval	Spanish	80	57	53	YG
268	6/23/01	El Monte		Legal Issues	Public Counsel	Spanish	63	38	37	YG
269	6/23/01	Palmdale		Special Needs	Gonzalez	English	16	15	14	RA
270	6/23/01	MAOF		Legal Issues	Bailer	English	35	12	12	JY
271	6/30/01	Pomona/Marshall		Business	Sanders	English	17	13	13	JY
272	6/30/01	San Gabriel		Health	Quan	Cantonese	39	22	21	LW
273	7/07/01	Carson Community Cntr		Special Needs	Tucker	English	79	45	42	YP
274	7/07/01	CPS		Activities	Avila	Spanish	61	49	46	MS
275	7/07/01	CCRC Lancaster		Business	Sandoval	Spanish	19	16	17	MS
276	7/14/01	St. Francis		Legal Issues	Public Counsel	English	70	37	37	YP
277	7/14/01	CHLA		Special Needs	Renteria	Spanish	88	57	58	YP
278	7/14/01	LA Conservation Corp		High Scope	Sutterlin	English	30	23	22	YP
279	7/18/01	LACOE		Activities	Allen	English	62	32	27	YP
280	7/21/00	LACOE		Business	Glover	English	60	35	35	YP
281	7/21/00	Northridge		Family Care	Wyatt	English	30	19	15	YP
282	7/21/00	Dolores Mission		Activities	Morgan	Spanish	62	38	38	YP
283	7/28/01	St. Luke's		Health	Sanders	English	62	28	23	YP
284	7/28/01	El Monte		Discipline	Chandler	Spanish	56	23	21	MS
285	7/28/01	Pomona/Marshall		Business	Sandoval	Spanish	25	17	15	MS
286	7/28/01	San Gabriel/McKinney		Legal Issues	Bailer	Mandarin	48	36	33	LW
287	8/04/01	Dolores Mission		Discipline	Chandler	Spanish	56	30	29	YG
288	8/04/01	Carson Community Cntr		Discipline	Tucker	English	59	40	38	JY
289	8/04/01	CCRC/Lancaster		Being the Best	Bello	English	18	16	15	RM
290	8/04/01	St. Luke's		Business	Sandoval	English	32	17	16	JY
291	8/11/01	LA Conservation Corp		High Scope	Alba	English	18	19	18	JY
292	8/11/01	ElMonte		Business - Cancelled						
293	8/11/01	Northridge		Special Needs	Cunningham	Spanish	41	34	33	YG
294	8/15/01	LACOE		Activities	Avila	Spanish	58	37	33	YG
295	8/18/01	CHLA		Legal Issues	Public Counsel	Spanish	55	38	35	YG
296	8/18/01	LACOE		Legal Issues	Bailer	English	61	25	25	JY
297	8/25/01	San Gabriel/McKinney		Legal Issues	Bailer	Cantonese	41	43	41	LW
298	8/25/01	St. Francis		Health	Soledad	Spanish	58	30	27	YG
299	8/25/01	Pomona/Marshall		Is Family Care-Cancelled						
300	8/25/01	MOAF/I.P.		Activities	Allen	English	56	26	24	JY

341	11/03/01	St. Francis			Discipline	Tucker	English	55	23	22	RM
342	11/03/01	CFS			Special Needs	Cunningham	Spanish	38	17	14	YG
343	11/10/01	CHLA			Discipline	Chandler	Spanish	62	36		
344	11/10/01	St. Luke's			Activities	Allen	English	41	30		
345	11/10/01	Winfandel Club			Health	Sanders	English	56	18		
346	11/14/01	LACOE			Legal Issues	Public Counsel	English	68	20		
347	11/17/01	LACOE			Business	Sandoval	Spanish	56	36		
348	11/17/01	Carson Community Cntr			Business	Glover	English	37	16		
349	12/01/01	CFS			Special Needs	Tucker	English	38	21	19	RA
350	12/01/01	CHLA			Everything You Wanted..	Leon	Spanish	66	42	38	YG
351	12/01/01	LACOE			Discipline	Chandler	Spanish	35	24	24	YG
352	12/08/01	LACOE			Health	Sanders	English	61	27	27	RA
353	12/08/01	CCRC			Health	Wyatt	English	25	13	13	RA
354	12/08/01	St. Francis			Activities	Avila	Spanish	62	30	29	YG
355	12/08/01	St. Luke's			Legal Issues	Public Counsel	Spanish	30	13	13	YG
356	12/13/01	LACOE			Everything You Wanted...	Green	English	73	28	28	RA
357	12/15/01	San Gabriel/McKinley			Discipline	Tucker	Cantonese	42	41	40	LW
358	1/12/02	Carson			Activities	Allen	English	52	25	24	RA
359	1/12/02	St. Luke's			Special Needs	Tucker	English	35	18	16	RA
360	1/12/02	CHLA			Health	Morgan	Spanish	53	38		
361	1/12/02	Northam Elementary			Being the Best	Bello	Spanish	25	74		
362	1/19/02	CCRC - Lancaster			Everything You Wanted..	Wyatt	English	38	23	22	JY
363	1/19/02	Covina			Discipline	Chandler					
364	1/19/02	North Branch Library			Business	Sandoval	English	62	36	37	RA
365	1/19/02	International Institute			Discipline	Tucker	Cantonese	27	22		
366	1/24/02	LACOE			Health	Sanders	English	65	41	41	RA
367	1/26/02	Winfandel club			Business	Glover	English	39	16	16	RA
368	1/26/02	LACOE			Special Needs	Cunningham	Spanish	55	26		
369	1/26/02	Hathaway Fam. Res.			Activities	Avila	Spanish	43	30	26	YG
370	1/26/02	San Gabriel/McKinley			Discipline	Tucker	Mandarin	40	41	39	LW
371	1/26/02	CCFC			Legal Issues	Public Counsel	Armenian	17	29		
372	2/02/02	Carson Community Cntr			Discipline	Tucker	English	36	25		
373	2/02/02	CHLA			Special Needs	Renteria	Spanish				
374	20202	S. Central Comm. Cntr			Activities	Allen	English				
375	2/09/02	LACOE			Special Needs	Tucker	English				
376	2/09/02	Panorama Presbyterian			Health	Morgan	Spanish				
377	2/09/02	Antelope Valley College			Business	Glover	English				
378	2/09/02	S. Central Comm. Cntr			Everything You Wanted..	Leon	Spanish				
379	2/16/02	CFS			IRS	IRS/Kwok	Cantonese				
380	2/20/02	LACOE			Business	Sandoval	Spanish				

APPENDIX 6

TRAININGS EVALUATION SCORING RUBRIC

v8	Licensed Day Care Provider (Licensed family child care provider)	Choices:	0=No answer 1=Yes
v9	Non-licensed Day Care Provider (Non-licensed child care provider)	Choices:	0=No answer 1=Yes
v10	Received license after attending workshops	Choices	0=No answer 1=Yes 2=Category not included on survey
v11	Licensed child care center staff	Choices	0=No answer 1=Yes 2=Category not included on survey
v12	Currently getting child care license	Choices	0=No answer 1=Yes 2=Category not included on survey
v13	Other answer provided	Choices	0=No other answer provided 1=Yes
v14	Ethnic/cultural background	Choices	0=No answer provided 1=Indian 2=Black or African-American 3=Hispanic/Latino 4=Chinese 5=Cambodian 6=Armenian 7=
v15	The value of the workshop was	Choices	0=No answer 1=Poor 2=Less than Adequate 3=Adequate 4=Good 5=Excellent 6=Question no asked on survey
v16	The organization of the training was	Choices	0=No answer 1=Poor 2=Less than Adequate 3=Adequate 4=Good 5=Excellent 6=Question not asked on survey
v17	The effectiveness of the presenter was	Choices	0=No answer 1=Poor 2=Less than Adequate 3=Adequate 4=Good 5=Excellent 6=Question not asked on survey
v18	Will this training change the way you care for children?	Choices	0=No answer 1=Yes 2=Question not asked on survey

NOTE: On many of the surveys, the questions stop at this point. Newer surveys do not include some of the previous questions, but do include part or all of the questions listed from this point forward. For the earlier surveys, leave SPSS blank from this point on. SPSS will fill in with a dot, indicating that there was no data. For the latest batch of surveys, go to variable 64 (q1new1).

v35	Two years old	Choices:	0=No 1=Yes
v36	Three years old	Choices:	0=No 1=Yes
v37	Four years old	Choices:	0=No 1=Yes
v38	Five years old	Choices:	0=No 1=Yes
v39	Six to seven years old	Choices:	0=No 1=Yes
v40	Eight to nine years old	Choices:	0=No 1=Yes
v41	Over ten years old	Choices:	0=No 1=Yes
v42-v45 identify ages of own children			
v42	Age of youngest	Number	
v43	Age of second youngest	Number	
v44	Age of third youngest	Number	
v45	Age of fourth youngest	Number	
v46	q1 Start up package useful	Choices	0=No response 1=Strongly Disagree 2=Disagree 3=Neutral 4=Agree 5=Strongly Agree
v47	q2 Start up should be continued	Choices	0=No response 1=Strongly Disagree 2=Disagree 3=Neutral 4=Agree 5=Strongly Agree
v48	q3 Information useful	Choices	0=No response 1=Strongly Disagree 2=Disagree 3=Neutral 4=Agree 5=Strongly Agree
v49	q4 Handouts/Materials useful	Choices	0=No response 1=Strongly Disagree 2=Disagree 3=Neutral 4=Agree 5=Strongly Agree

For q5-q16 (v50-v61), each item has a number 0 (no response) through 12 (least useful)

v50	q5	Ages and Stages	Number (0 through 12)
v51	q6	Children's Books	Number (0 through 12)
v52	q7	Musical Moon/Soft Books	Number (0 through 12)

APPENDIX 7

TRAINING ATTENDANCE BY TOPIC, YEAR, AND LANGUAGE GROUP

Table 40: Training Attendance by Topic and Year: Mandarin Language

Topic	1999	2000	2001	Total
Legal Issues	-	25	33	58
Health and Safety	-	21	-	21
Business & Marketing	-	-	63	63
Activities & Understanding	-	28	41	69
CalWORKs	-	-	30	30
Special Needs	-	-	55	55
Being Your Best	-	-	-	-
Curriculum	-	-	-	-
Discipline with Love	-	-	-	-
Family Care	-	-	-	-
High Scope	-	-	-	-
Is Child Care for You?/Everything You Wanted to Know About Child Care But Were Afraid to Ask!	-	-	-	-
Total	-	74	222	296

Table 41: Training Attendance by Topic and Year: Cantonese Language

Topic	1999	2000	2001	Total
Legal Issues	-	45	41	86
Health and Safety	-	-	-	-
Business & Marketing	-	40	21	61
Activities & Understanding	-	-	27	27
CalWORKs	-	-	34	34
Special Needs	-	-	-	-
Being Your Best	-	-	-	-
Curriculum	-	-	-	-
Discipline with Love	-	-	-	-
Family Care	-	-	-	-
High Scope	-	-	-	-
Is Child Care for You?/Everything You Wanted to Know About Child Care But Were Afraid to Ask!	-	-	-	-
Data Not Available	-	-	21	21
Total	-	85	144	229

APPENDIX 8

LICENSING STATUS BY LANGUAGE GROUPS

Of the 321 Mandarin Language participants whose evaluations were analyzed, 173 (54%) reported that they were licensed. Twenty-one (7%) reported that they were not licensed; 36 (11%) reported that they were in the process of obtaining a child care license.

Table 45: Licensing Status of Participants Completing Evaluations: Mandarin Language Group

Licensing Status (N = 321)	From 5/4/99	2000	2001	Total
Licensed Day Care Provider				
Licensed Family Child Care Provider	-	47	119	166
Received License After Attending Training*	-	-	62	62
Licensed Child Care Center Staff	-	2	5	7
Currently Getting Child Care License	-	18	18	36
Other Answer Provided	-	7	14	21
Total	-	74	218	292

Of the 269 Cantonese Language participants whose evaluations were analyzed, 137 (51%) reported that they were licensed. Thirty-six (13%) reported that they were not licensed; 27 (10%) reported that they were in the process of obtaining a child care license.

Table 46: Licensing Status of Participants Completing Evaluations: Cantonese Language Group

Licensing Status (N = 269)	From 5/4/99	2000	2001	Total
Licensed Day Care Provider				
Licensed Family Child Care Provider	-	38	86	124
Received License After Attending Training*	-	3	30	33
Licensed Child Care Center Staff	-	8	5	13
Currently Getting Child Care License*	-	3	24	27
Other Answer Provided	-	-	8	8
Total	-	52	153	205

Of the 76 Cambodian Language participants whose evaluations were analyzed, none reported that they were licensed. Four (5%) reported that they were not licensed; 38 (50%) reported that they were in the process of obtaining a child care license.

Table 47: Licensing Status of Participants Completing Evaluations: Cambodian Language Group

Licensing Status (N = 76)	From 5/4/99	2000	2001	Total
Licensed Day Care Provider				
Licensed Family Child Care Provider	-	-	-	-
Received License After Attending Training*	-	-	-	-
Licensed Child Care Center Staff	3	-	-	3
Currently Getting Child Care License*	38	-	-	38
Other Answer Provided	4	-	-	4
Total	45	-	-	45

* Attendees choosing this response would have attended a prior training and may have responded affirmatively to both this category and the one above.

Appendix 9

Evaluation of Value of Training by Language Group and by Year

Two thousand one hundred and fifty-three (83%) of the 2590 English Language respondents rated the value of the training as "Excellent." A total of 2516 (97%) of the respondents rated the value of the training as "Good" or "Excellent."

Table 48: Value of the Workshop/Training: English Language Trainings

English Language: N = 2590 The value of the workshop was:	From 5/4/99	2000	2001	Total
1 - Poor	-	1	1	2
2	-	8	3	11
3	31	19	11	61
4	164	181	18	363
5 - Excellent	895	1142	116	2153

One thousand nine hundred and sixty-seven (93%) of the 2,126 Spanish Language respondents rated the value of the training as "Excellent." A total of 2106 (99%) of the respondents rated the value of the training as "Good" or "Excellent."

Table 49: Value of the Workshop/Training: Spanish Language Trainings

Spanish Language: N = 2126 The value of the workshop was:	From 5/4/99	2000	2001	Total
1 - Poor	-	-	-	-
2	1	2	-	3
3	4	11	2	17
4	61	61	17	139
5 - Excellent	706	1149	112	1967

One hundred seventeen (94%) of the 124 Mandarin Language respondents rated the value of the training as "Excellent." A total of 122 (98%) of the respondents rated the value of the training as "Good" or "Excellent."

Table 50: Value of the Workshop/Training: Mandarin Language Trainings

Mandarin Language: N = 124 The value of the workshop was:	From 5/4/99	2000	2001	Total
1 - Poor	-	1	-	1
2	-	-	-	-
3	-	1	-	1
4	-	3	2	5
5 - Excellent	-	89	28	117

APPENDIX 10

RATING OF TRAINING ORGANIZATION BY LANGUAGE GROUPS AND YEAR

One hundred four (90%) of the 115 Cantonese Language respondents rated the organization of the workshop "Excellent;" 115 (100%) rated the value "Good" or "Excellent."

Table 56: Organization of the Training: Cantonese Language Trainings

Cantonese Language: N = 115 The organization of the training was:	From 5/4/99	2000	2001	Total
1 - Poor	-	-	-	-
2	-	-	-	-
3	-	-	-	-
4	-	9	2	11
5 - Excellent	-	72	32	104

Seventy-one (93%) of the 76 Cambodian Language respondents rated the organization of the workshop "Excellent;" 76 (100%) rated the value "Good" or "Excellent."

Table 57: Organization of the Training: Cambodian Language Trainings

Cambodian Language: N = 76 The organization of the training was:	From 5/4/99	2000	2001	Total
1 - Poor	-	-	-	-
2	-	-	-	-
3	-	-	-	-
4	5	-	-	5
5 - Excellent	71	-	-	71

Appendix 11

Rating of Presenters By Language Group and By Year

Two thousand one hundred seventy-nine (85%) of the 2565 English Language respondents rated the effectiveness of their trainer "Excellent;" 2486 (97%) rated the effectiveness "Good" or "Excellent."

Table 58: Effectiveness of Presenter: English Language Trainings

English Language: N = 2565 The effectiveness of the presenter was:	From 5/4/99	2000	2001	Total
1 - Poor	3	3	3	9
2	2	6	4	12
3	26	23	9	58
4	137	154	16	307
5 - Excellent	910	1155	114	2179

One thousand nine hundred and sixty-seven (94%) of the 2096 Spanish Language respondents rated the effectiveness of their presenter "Excellent;" 2,074 (99%) rated the effectiveness "Good" or "Excellent."

Table 59: Effectiveness of the Presenter: Spanish Language Trainings

Spanish Language: N = 2096 The effectiveness of the presenter was:	From 5/4/99	2000	2001	Total
1 - Poor	-	-	-	-
2	-	3	-	3
3	5	8	6	19
4	44	52	11	107
5 - Excellent	707	1145	115	1967

One hundred and seven (87%) of the 123 Mandarin Language respondents rated the effectiveness of their presenter "Excellent;" 108 (96%) rated the effectiveness "Good" or "Excellent."

Table 60: Effectiveness of the Presenter: Mandarin Language Trainings

Mandarin Language: N = 117 The effectiveness of the presenter was:	From 5/4/99	2000	2001	Total
1 - Poor	-	1	-	1
2	-	2	-	2
3	-	2	-	2
4	-	9	2	11
5 - Excellent	-	79	28	107

APPENDIX 12

RESPONSES TO SIX QUESTIONS ON 2001 POST-TRAINING SURVEY BY YEAR: SPANISH AND ENGLISH LANGUAGE GROUPS

2. Group Activity was Useful.

Nine hundred nineteen (86%) of the 1,066 English Language respondents selected "*Strongly Agree*" that the group activity was useful; 1,022 (96%) selected either "*Strongly Agree*" or "*Agree*."

Table 65: Usefulness of Group Activity: English Language Groups

N = 1066	
Choices	2001
Strongly Disagree	21
Disagree	7
Neutral	16
Agree	103
Strongly Agree	919

One thousand one hundred and twenty-eight (91%) of the 1,227 Spanish Language respondents selected "*Strongly Agree*" that the group activity was useful; 1,203 (98%) selected either "*Strongly Agree*" or "*Agree*."

Table 66: Usefulness of Group Activity: Spanish Language Groups

N = 1227	
Choices	2001
Strongly Disagree	17
Disagree	1
Neutral	6
Agree	75
Strongly Agree	1128

3. The handouts were useful

Nine hundred sixty-eight (90%) of the 1072 English Language respondents selected "*Strongly Agree*" that the handouts distributed during the training were useful; 1,039 (97%) selected either "*Strongly Agree*" or "*Agree*."

Table 67: Usefulness of Handouts: English Language Groups

N = 1072	
Choices	2001
Strongly Disagree	27
Disagree	1
Neutral	5
Agree	71
Strongly Agree	968

5. The workshop met my needs.

Nine hundred sixty-four (90%) of the 1,070 English Language respondents selected "*Strongly Agree*" that the workshop training met their personal needs; 1,034 (97%) selected either "*Strongly Agree*" or "*Agree*."

Table 71: Workshop Met Personal Needs: English Language Groups

N = 1070	
Choices	2001
Strongly Disagree	26
Disagree	4
Neutral	6
Agree	70
Strongly Agree	964

One thousand one hundred and sixty-six (95%) of the 1,230 Spanish Language respondents selected "*Strongly Agree*" that the workshop training met their personal needs; 1,208 (98%) selected either "*Strongly Agree*" or "*Agree*."

Table 72: Workshop Met Personal Needs: Spanish Language Groups

N = 1230	
Choices	2001
Strongly Disagree	16
Disagree	2
Neutral	4
Agree	42
Strongly Agree	1166

6. I am interested in more workshops.

More than 99% of respondents expressed an interest in attending more workshops.

Table 73: Interest in Attending More Workshops

Language Group	Yes	No	Total
English Language Group	1051	7	1058
Spanish Language Group	1214	4	1240
Total	2265	11	2298

Appendix 13

Attendance at Trainings May 1999 through December 2001 by Month

Table 74: Distribution of Training Attendance by Months: 1999-2001

Month	Frequency	Percentage
January	464	5%
February	641	8%
March	664	8%
April	778	9%
May	657	8%
June	886	11%
July	1001	12%
August	944	11%
September	841	10%
October	616	7%
November	438	5%
December	485	6%
Total	8375	100%

Los Angeles County Office of Education
Child Care Training Institute

Evaluation

Please tell us about yourself (*check one*):

☒ Licensed child care provider

☐ Non-licensed child care provider

Zip code where you are providing child care 90302

Check all of the Child Care Training Institute workshops that you have attended.

☐ Be the Best You Can Be

☒ Business and Marketing

☒ Building Quality Child Care —
Activities and Understanding Each
Child's Unique Needs

☐ Discipline With Love

☒ Legal Issues

☒ Building Quality Child Care — Health
and Safety Issues and Communicating
with Parents

☐ Understanding CalWorks Child Care

☐ Working with Special Needs Children

What month and year did you receive the CCTI Start-up Package (*example: 04/99*)? 05/00?

As of today, are you providing child care in your home? ☒ Yes ☐ No

If yes, for how many children?

What are their ages?

What are the ages of your own children?

11
1-12
grown

Please circle the number that indicates your agreement with the following statements:

Start-up Package

1. The Start-up Package was useful for my family daycare.

Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 Strongly Agree 5

2. The Start-up Package is beneficial and should be continued for participants who complete requirements.

1 2 3 4 5

Oficina de Educación del Condado de Los Angeles
Instituto de Entrenamiento sobre el Cuidado de Niños

Encuesta

Por favor díganos acerca de usted (*marque uno*):

☒ Proveedor de cuidados con licencia

☐ Proveedor de cuidados sin licencia

Código postal donde provee cuidado de niños 90640

Marque los talleres de el Instituto de Entrenamiento sobre el Cuidado de Niños a los que ha asistido.

☒ Ser Lo Mejor Que Puede Ser

☒ Promoción y Manejo del Negocio

☒ Construyendo Cuidado de Niños de
Calidad—Actividades y
Comprendiendo las Necesidades Unicas
de Cada Niño

☒ Disciplina con Amor

☒ Temas Legales

☒ Construyendo Cuidado de Niños de
Calidad—Asuntos de Salud y
Seguridad y Como Comunicarse con
los Padres

☒ Comprendiendo el Cuidado de Niños
CalWorks

☐ Trabajando con Niños que tienen
Necesidades Especiales

¿En que mes y año recibió usted su paquete para empezar su guardería del CCTI?

(por ejemplo: 04/99) 06/99

Desde Mayo 99

¿Desde hoy, ésta usted proveyendo cuidado de niños en su hogar? ☒ Si ☐ No

Si es así, ¿Para cuantos niños?

¿Cuales son sus edades?

¿Cuales son las edades de sus propios hijos?

5
2 años 3 años, 4, 7 y 10
10 y 12

Por favor circule el numero que indica su acuerdo con las siguientes declaraciones:

Paquete para Empezar su Guardería Casera

	<u>Totalmente</u> <u>en desacuerdo</u>		<u>Ni de acuerdo</u> <u>o en desacuerdo</u>		<u>Totalmente</u> <u>de acuerdo</u>
1. El Paquete para empezar fue útil para mi centro de cuidado de niños familiar.	1	2	3	4	(5)
2. El Paquete para empezar es de gran beneficio y debe ser continuado para los participantes que completen los requerimientos.	1	2	3	4	(5)

洛縣教育局 托兒照顧訓練學院

問卷調查

請讓我們知道你是（圈上其中一個）：

☒ 持執照托兒工作者

☐ 非持執照托兒工作者

閣下提供托兒服務之郵區：90132

圈上閣下曾參加過的培訓課程：

☒ 盡己能做到最好

☐ 生意與市場

☒ 建立質優之托兒 - 活動及瞭解個別兒童之需要

☒ 以「愛」作管教

☒ 建立質優之托兒 - 健康與安全事宜及與家長溝通

☐ 法律事宜

☒ 瞭解「以工代賑」托兒事宜

☒ 從事有特殊需要之兒童的工作

閣下於何年何月接受托兒照顧訓練學院所送出的「開業錦囊？」
（例如：04 / 99）about 10-2000

直至目前為止，閣下是否仍在家中提供托兒服務？

☒ 是 ☐ 否

如是，照顧多少名兒童？2

他們的年齡？4

閣下自己子女的年齡？7

請就下面所說圈上適合的數字以表示閣下之同意程度：

「開業錦囊」	極不同意	兩者皆不是	極之同意
1) 開業錦囊對本人之日托之家非常有用	1	2 3 4	<input checked="" type="radio"/> 5
2) 開業錦囊益處甚多並應繼續贈予完成培訓課程的參予者	1	2 3 4	<input checked="" type="radio"/> 5

APPENDIX 15

START-UP PACKAGES DISTRIBUTION BY ZIP CODE, SUPERVISORAL DISTRICT, AND LANGUAGE GROUPS

90047	4			4
90059	2	1		2
90061		1		1
90062	1			1
90066		2		2
90220	5			5
90221	2	1		3
90222	1			1
90230	1			1
90247	1			1
90250	1			1
90262		1		1
90301	2			2
90302	2			2
90303	2			2
90305	3			3
90745	2	1		3
90746	4			4
90810	2			2
District 3 (5)				
90004		1		1
90039		1		1
91342	1			1
91402	1			1
91605	1			1
District 4 (15)				
90242		1		1
90501	1			1
90650	2			2
90712	1			1
90723	1			1
90804	2			2
90805	3			3
90806	2			2
90807	1			1
90815	1			1
District 5 (19)				
91801		1	1	2
90805		2		2
90806		1		1
91016	1			1
91101	1			1
91103	1			1
91104	1			1

APPENDIX 16

RANKING GIVEN BY RECIPIENTS TO MATERIALS IN START-UP PACKAGE BY LANGUAGE GROUP

Table 78: Rankings given by Recipients to Start-Up Package Materials: Mandarin and Cantonese

Item	Ranking	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
Child Care Manuals	9	2	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	4	-	-	-
Children's Books*													
Soft Books/Musical Moon	14	2	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	-	-	-	-
Sorting & Counting Beads	11	3	3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Wrist Bells	10	-	1	-	2	3	2	-	-	-	-	-	-
Parachute	13	1	-	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	1	-	-
Art Supplies	10	-	2	2	2	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Cars	10	-	2	1	2	-	-	3	-	-	-	-	-
First Aid Kit*													
Mats	18	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Puzzles	11	3	-	1	2	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Farm Animals	1	-	-	2	-	1	-	-	-	-	3	-	-

* Not included on Evaluation Form for this group

Person Contacted: _____ Phone # _____

Entry number: _____ Workshop Attended/Date _____

Interviewer: _____ Language: _____

Date/Time: Attempt 1 _____ Attempt 2 _____ Attempt 3 _____

Comments:

Hello. This is (YOUR NAME). I'm calling for the Los Angeles County Office of Education and the University of California Department of Education. We would like to ask you some questions about your experiences with the Child Care Training Institute Workshops. We want to continue offering and improving these free certificated workshops.

Do you have a few minutes now (ABOUT 10 IF THEY ASK) or would you like me to contact you at a later time? IF THEY CHOOSE THIS OPTION, THEN FOLLOW WITH: When would be the best time to call you?

1. How did you first learn about the Child Care Training Institute Workshops?

2. (a) Which Child Care Training Institute Workshops have you attended?

THE TITLES BELOW CAN BE USED AS A PROMPT IF NEEDED)

_____ 1=Legal Issues

_____ 8=Curriculum

_____ 2=Health and Safety

_____ 9=Discipline with Love

_____ 3=Business & Marketing

_____ 10=Family Care

_____ 4=Activities & Understanding

_____ 11=High Scope

_____ 5=CalWORKS

_____ 12=Is Child Care for You?

_____ 6=Special Needs

_____ Other _____

_____ 7=Being Your Best (Be The Best You Can Be) _____

(b) Which workshop did you like the best? _____

6. What materials given out during the Child Care Training Institute Workshop did you particularly like?

Why?

7. Did you consider any of the materials not very helpful? *CIRCLE:* Yes No

IF YES, (a) What wasn't helpful?

(b) Why wasn't it helpful?

8. How could the Child Care Training Institute Workshop(s) have been more helpful to you?

Persona Contactada: _____ Teléfono _____

Número de entrada: _____ Fecha de Asistencia al taller _____

Entrevistador: _____ Idioma: _____

Fecha/hora: Intento 1 _____ Intento 2 _____ Intento 3 _____

Comentarios:

Hola, Mi nombre es (_____). Le estoy llamando de parte de la Oficina de Educación del Condado de Los Ángeles, y del Departamento de Educación de la Universidad de California. Nos gustaría hacerle algunas preguntas sobre la experiencia que tuvo en el o los talleres de Instituto de Entrenamiento sobre el Cuidado de Niños. Deseamos continuar ofreciendo y mejorando estos talleres de certificación gratuitos.

¿Tiene unos minutos (aproximadamente 10, en caso de que pregunten) o preferiría que me comunicara con usted más tarde?

SI ESCOGE ESTA OPCIÓN, PROCEDA CON:

¿Cuál es la mejor hora para llamarle?

1. ¿Cómo se enteró de los talleres que ofrece el Instituto de Entrenamiento sobre el Cuidado de Niños?

2. (a) A cuales talleres de Instituto de Entrenamiento sobre el Cuidado de Niños a asistido usted?

EN CASO DE SER NECESARIO, PUEDE USAR DE REFERENCIA LOS SIGUIENTES TEMAS)

_____ 1=Asuntos Legales

_____ 8=Plan de Estudios

_____ 2=Asuntos de salud y seguridad.

_____ 9=Disciplinando a los niños con Amor

_____ 3=Promoción y Manejo del Negocio

_____ 10=Cuidado de niños familiar

_____ 4=Actividades

_____ 5=CalWORKS

_____ 12= ¿Es el negocio de cuidado de niños para usted? Todo lo que usted quiere saber acerca del cuidado de niños familiar.

_____ 6=Trabajando con niños que tienen Necesidades Especiales

_____ Otros _____

_____ 7=Ser lo mejor que puede ser. _____

6. Del material que le dieron en el taller del Instituto de Entrenamiento de Cuidado de Niños, ¿Cuál le gustó más?

¿Por qué?

7. ¿Consideró usted que alguno de los materiales no haya sido muy útil?
CIRCULE: Sí No

SI CONTESTA SÍ, (a) ¿Qué no fue útil?

(b) ¿Por qué no fue útil?

8. ¿Cómo pudo haber sido el taller más provechoso para usted?

Person Contacted: _____ Phone # _____

Entry number: _____ Workshop Attended/Date _____

Interviewer: _____ Language: _____

Date/Time: Attempt 1 _____ Attempt 2 _____ Attempt 3 _____

Comments:

我是從洛杉磯教育局和加州大學教育部打來的
Hello. This is (YOUR NAME). I'm calling for the Los Angeles County Office of Education and the University of California Department of Education. We would like to ask you some questions about your experiences with the Child Care Training Institute Workshops. We want to continue offering and improving these free certificated workshops.

請問你現在有空嗎, 只需要10分鐘就好。還是你要我晚一點再跟你聯絡?
Do you have a few minutes now (ABOUT 10 IF THEY ASK) or would you like me to contact you at a later time? IF THEY CHOOSE THIS OPTION, THEN FOLLOW WITH: When would be the best time to call you?

講習=研討會

1. 請問你是怎麼知道這一系列的托兒照顧講習呢?
How did you first learn about the Child Care Training Institute Workshops?

2. 請問你有參加過那些托兒照顧講習呢?
(a) Which Child Care Training Institute Workshops have you attended?

THE TITLES BELOW CAN BE USED AS A PROMPT IF NEEDED)

- | | |
|--|------------------------------------|
| _____ 1=Legal Issues 法律事宜 | _____ 8=Curriculum 課程安排 |
| _____ 2=Health and Safety 健康與安全 | _____ 9=Discipline with Love 以愛作管教 |
| _____ 3=Business & Marketing 生意市場 | _____ 10=Family Care 家庭照顧 |
| _____ 4=Activities & Understanding 活動與瞭解 | _____ 11=High Scope 中學 |
| _____ 5=CalWORKS | _____ 12=Is Child Care for You? |
| _____ 6=Special Needs 特殊需要 | _____ Other _____ |
| _____ 7=Being Your Best (Be The Best You Can Be)
盡己能做到的最好 | |

- 那一丁講習你最喜欢?
(b) Which workshop did you like the best? _____

- 請問在托兒照顧講習中所發出的教材裡哪一樣是您特別喜歡?
6. What materials given out during the Child Care Training Institute Workshop did you particularly like?

為什麼?
Why?

- 請問有沒有哪一樣教材是您覺得不太有幫助的?
7. Did you consider any of the materials not very helpful? CIRCLE: Yes No
那一樣?
IF YES, (a) What wasn't helpful?

為什麼?
(b) Why wasn't it helpful?

- 請問我們該如何讓托兒照顧講習能更加幫助您呢?
8. How could the Child Care Training Institute Workshop(s) have been more helpful to you?

APPENDIX 18

DISTRIBUTION OF NUMBERS ASSIGNED FOR TELEPHONE INTERVIEWS

APPENDIX 19

REPORTS FROM PARTICIPANT OBSERVATIONS AT FIVE WORKSHOPS

Laura Sandoval used simple diagrams such as pie charts to illustrate some of her points. For example, when she was talking about what portion of marketing you should devote most of your energy into, she broke it down so that we all could see which techniques were the best ways. She also made simple scenarios integrating some of the people at the workshop to show some more examples. Overall she did a very good job of engaging the people at the workshop and was very courteous to all.

The keys to this workshop's success are everything I mentioned above such as raffles, donuts and coffee, good location, evaluations, and a good presenter. Another neat little thing they give you after the workshop is a certificate certifying you for 4 hours of whatever workshop you took. I think that is another important aspect of this workshop. I think the only improvement they can expand on is marker board Laura was using. The marker board made things hard to see because certain marks would not erase, but these are all things they can expand on.

I think the most important part of the workshop had to be the supporting material that Laura Sandoval presented. Without it, I don't think any of the things above matter. I think it is very important that people leave that workshop knowing that what they learned that day could help them boost their businesses. Thus, the material that was presented in the workshop was the most significant aspect of the workshop.

about her life and personal experiences in the field of ChildCare. It was a comfortable environment where people opened up and made comments about their work.

- D. Laura Sandoval's presentation was organized, detailed and interesting. She went through all the points of the outline in a slow pace, making sure everyone understood. She introduced the material by talking about the large Latino community in California and how they ought to find their place as part of the society. I liked the fact that she kept telling her audience about the importance of education for children and how it can actually impact their lives if you encourage children to learn. Then she briefly discussed other aspects of ChildCare such as the legal issues, activities with the kids, their motivation, health and safety, and working with disabled kids. There were a lot of facts she had to cover, especially when she talked about taxes and other legal issues, but it was helpful info that everyone wanted to know to run their businesses. The information overall was well presented.
- E. At this workshop we were provided with a folder containing the outline of the presentation, an agenda from the Child Care Institute, a list of support groups, "Parents" magazine, and summary of laws that they need to be aware of, an outline to make a business plan and a notepad. The outline was very helpful because it guided us through her presentation.
- F. It was a good workshop. Besides the useful information, they had a raffle, which made the workshop more exciting. Additionally, we were provided with some coffee and cookies in the morning. The coffee was a good idea because it helped people concentrate better. They also got a certificate of completion at the end of the workshop, to prove that they attended the workshop. Many times, Laura Sandoval announced that they were giving out the Start-Up Package, which includes up to \$250 worth of first aid and other materials for their Child Care centers, to people who attend more of these workshops.
- G. The most significant aspect of the workshop was the detailed information and the tips that Laura shared with the participants. Her presentation had many practical ideas for the ChildCare centers inside the house as well as outside. She also explained in detail how to organize finances and pay taxes, emphasizing the fact that everyone should pay taxes now so that they can have a good retirement plan in the future. In this way,

Linda Wang
ID# 91230625
1 / 26 / 2002
Education 199
Childcare Workshop

Workshop theme: Discipline Children with Love
Location: McKinley Middle School Cafeteria, San Gabriel
Date: 1 / 26 / 2002 Saturday
Language: English translated into Mandarin

A. Location

The location of this workshop is held in the cafeteria of McKinley Middle School.

The cafeteria itself is very large, with about twenty-six lunch long lunch tables. The cafeteria can also be used as an auditorium with a stage in the front of the cafeteria. The room is also decorated with flags made by each classroom displaying the message they want to send to other people. There are also class pictures of previously graduated students. This tells me that the school is integrating students together with artwork and pictures of students.

The buildings of the school look rather aged but still look very well built. The school is wire fenced all the way around except with the outermost building being the beginning and the end of the fence. The outermost building is the cafeteria. The overall color of the school is white with blue trimming.

The area of the school is a middle-class residential area. The houses around the area are mixed. Some are small and some are two-story elegantly built houses. There is a lot of traffic on the larger street entering the school, but the school is located at the end of a small street, so it is much quieter than the cross street. A few blocks down the cross street is a main street of Chinese stores. There are supermarkets, restaurants, and shops along the street and traffic gets quite crowded.

Pamela Kwok is the interpreter for this workshop. She is native Cantonese speaker but is translating the presentation into Mandarin.

D. Structure of the Presentation

The presentation starts off by first welcoming the participants.

Next is general question and answer for the participants regarding childcare on issues such as licensing and class requirements.

There is a packet of worksheets in Chinese and the overall workshop is to go over the sheets with more explanation on how to discipline children in the best possible ways so children will be able to grow up in the best environment that will strengthen positive characteristics.

The presentation starts off by introducing how the brain works and develops in a child in a general format. While giving information on how the brain develops, the presenter also gives examples on how difference aspects of development results in what types of behavior in a child. This is to tell the participants that what they see in a child's behavior is perhaps a result of their development.

After a fifteen minute break, the presenter goes on to link brain development and behavior. She first presents an ABC of behavior. A is for antecedent, the cause of a particular behavior. B is for behavior, the actual behavior of the child. And C is the consequence, what happens after the behavior. An example given is that when a child sees candy and wants the candy, the child will ask for the candy. Often times, the parent will say no, which is the antecedent of the behavior about to occur. Upon hearing the no, the child will probably starts to cry, that is the actual behavior as a result of the antecedent. As a consequence, the parent will probably give in and says

emotional needs of the child. This is when the child is not receiving the required attention resulting in deviation of behavior.

The last part of the presentation is teaching the participants how to guide children and to teach children to behave in positive ways and for care providers to resolve any conflict as a result of certain behavior in positive manners.

E. Supporting Workshop Materials

The supporting materials include a packet of handouts translated into Chinese for participants to read and understand the overall structure of the workshop in discipline children with love. There are also diagrams and drawings by the presenter to give aid in better understanding how to go about discipline children with love.

F. Keys to Success

There are many keys to success in this workshop. There is raffle, which I was one of the three that won a prize! There is also survey on the value of the workshop. The participants also get certificate that will work toward their licensing requirement. The worksheets are also great in communicating and giving further reference for the participants in their child care career.

G. Most significant aspect of workshop

The most significant aspect of the workshop is linking the biological aspect of human behavior to the social aspect of human behavior together. This is crucial to know that human behavior can be influenced from the biological aspect as well as the sociological aspect.

Supporting Workshop Materials: Each participant received a yellow folder with the following:

- Ruler
- Notepad
- Listing of Family Child Care Associations and Support Groups
- Chart of 2001 Los Angeles Regional Market Rate Ceilings
- “Handout # 15: Tips for Getting In Tune”
- Southern California Child Care Resource and Referral Services
- “Handout # 5: Supporting Exploration and Discovery”
- “How Children Solve Problems”
- “Brain Research, Infant Learning, and Child Care Curriculum” (Lally)
- California Association for Family Child Care Legislature/Public Policy
- Membership Information: National Association for Family Child Care
- “For Kids’ Sake” (U.S. Consumer Product Safety Commission)
- “Play is Fundamental” (McCracken)
- “Tools for Learning” (National Association for the Education of Young Children)
- “Teaching Young Children to Resist Bias” (Derman-Sparks, Gutierrez, Phillips)
- “Ten Keys to Culturally Sensitive Child Care”
- “Which Toy for Which Child: Birth through Five?” (U.S. Consumer Product Safety Commission)
- “Which Toy for Which Child: Six through Twelve?” (U.S. Consumer Product Safety Commission)
- Health Coverage for your Child
- “Let’s Read”
- “Let’s Write”
- “Let’s Do Math”
- “Learning Through Moving” (Andreasen)
- “Science Lessons for Young Children” (Andreasen)
- “Language Development” (UC Cooperative Extension)
- “Toys for Toddlers” (UC Cooperative Extension)
- “Toys and Games for Babies” (US Cooperative Extension)
- “Read to Your Child”
- America Reads Challenge Poster
- Evaluation

Keys to Success: The dynamic personality and obvious commitment of the presenter to child care and to teaching were contagious. Her ideas and her examples were creative and easily replicated. Her demonstrations were clear and focused on helping providers achieve success. The multiple demonstrations and the brisk pacing of the workshop resulted in much information conveyed in a relatively short period of time. The packets were appreciated, as were the raffle items; but the most appreciated items were the directions, patterns, and samples that Ms. Allen gave to the participants. The last hour, during which attendees were able to make their own items, was very productive and very appreciated.

Most Significant Aspect of Workshop: Participants truly were impressed with the number of innovative and educational items and activities that could be created with donated and recycled materials.